"THE 'I' AND 'THOU' RELATIONSHIP – A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MARTIN BUBER AND MADHVĀCĀRYA"

THE THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MYSORE
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
PHILOSOPHY

BY

R. N. VIJAYA KUMAR

DEPARTMENT OF POST-GRADUATE STUDIES AND
RESEARCH IN PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITY OF MYSORE, MANASAGANGOTRI,
MYSORE-6.

2002

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the Thesis: " THE 'I' AND 'THOU' RELATIONSHIP —A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MARTIN BUBER AND MADHVĀCĀRYA", by R.N. Vijaya Kumar, submitted to the University of Mysore for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, is prepared under my guidance and supervision and it has not been the basis in part or full for the award of any diploma or degree in this or any other University.

Place: Mysore

Dated: 16-11-2002

(Dr.V.N. Sheshagiri Rao)

Dr. V. N. Sheshagiri Rao,
M.A., Ph.D.,
Professor of Philosophy,
University of Mysore,
Manasa Gangothri,
MYSORE-570 006.

Rarest Archiver

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the entire work embodied in this Thesis has been carried out by me. The extent of information derived from the existing literature has been indicated and fully acknowledged in the Thesis at the appropriate places. The Work is original and has not been submitted in part or in full for any diploma or degree in this or any other University.

Vijayak. R.N.

Place: Mysore (R.N. Vijaya Kumar)

Dated: 16.11.2002.

Rarest Archiver

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to my dear guide Prof. Dr. V. N. Sheshagiri Rao of the Post-Graduate Department of Philosophy, Manasagangotri, University of Mysore, for his invaluable and insightful guidance and suggestions at every step in the execution of the Thesis. If not for his able guidance and I-Thou Relationship between us, the present Thesis would not have seen the light of the day.

The Philanthropic and I-Thou relational personalities of the O.C D. Carmelite Family of K.G. Province, especially the then Provincial Rev. Fr. Lawrence D'Mello O.C.D and his team, the present Provincial Rev. Fr. Joe Tauro (my only source of inspiration and encouragement) and his team, continuously assisted and supported me to pursue the Research. Prof. Dr. Gregory D' Souza OCD, Dept. of Christianity of Mysore University encouraged me with the idea of making a comparative study of I-THOU relationship between Martin Buber and Madhvācārya. Dr. Dominic Charles Vaz OCD assisted me with his valuable books on Madhvācārya for the Research work. My grateful thanks to all these persons.

My sincere thanks are due to the Staff and students of Pushpashrama, college of Philosophy Mysore, the Mysore University Library, the Library of St. Peter's Pontifical Seminary Bangalore, the South Asia Theological College Bangalore and Prof. K.T. Pandurangi for providing me with valuable books and suggestions.

Finally, my heartfelt gratitude to all my family members, relatives, friends, benefactors, for their support and guidance who made me to achieve this goal through their prayers and encouragements.

Vijayak · R · N ·

MYSORE — R.N.VIJAYA KUMAR

DATE: 16. 11 · 2002 ·

Rarest Archiver

PREFACE

Down the Centuries, the human person has been devalued especially in the West through materialistic and materializing trends and systems. In the seventeenth century many thinkers in Europe considered human beings nothing more than sophisticated machines. And later dialectical materialism while attempting to consider society and state as absolute tended to reduce individual persons to the road and status of the wheels of totalitarianism. These forms of theoretical as well as practical materialism have reduced human beings to the status of things and commodities in so called civilized societies, cultures and even in our country.

In the wake of the industrial revolution and modern technological advancement which often cater to military domination, consumerism and business competition, human beings have become the slaves of machines and net works of companies of one kind or another. More than a century ago Oliver Goldsmith had commenced his poem, 'The deserted village', with these words; "Unhappy lies the land to hastening ills a prey where wealth accumulates and men decay".

George Orwell in his novel, '1984' draws a grim picture of the human situation of our modern century in these words: "If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face and forever". The raw realities which we confront everyday will confirm it. Morally, socially, politically, economically and at different levels, the dehumanization is taking place. Monstrous atrocities such as extermination of races, tribes, racial discriminations, the manifold manipulations of man through science and technology, barbarous and iniquitous laws such as legalization of abortion, mercy killing, etc., are symbols of dehumanization.

Rarest Archiver

Although trade, commerce, business and other institutions bring people nearer to each other physically, the real interpersonal relationships are rapidly declining. Hundreds and thousands of innocent ladies are being sold in the flesh markets for money in the commercial cities. They symbolize the heartless sadism of humanity. Children and youth have become prey to drugs, alcohol and other types of social evils. Persons are used but things are loved.

The sad and barbarous effects of the process of depersonalization at the theoretical level on the one hand and the painful experience of the factors that lead to dehumanization and human misery on the other were the forces that determined the choice of a research topic which, it is hoped may point in however small a measure to the evil effects of further deterioration and decay of the concept of the human personhood. It also suggests to the improvement in the day-to-day treatment of human beings.

In order to purse this research more firmly in the Indian personalistic context, it is felt that the idea of comparing the contemporary existential German thinker Martin Buber with the Indian Ācārya of thirteenth century A.D., the Dvaita thinker Śrī Madhvācārya is essential. The reason for selecting both the thinkers is that these thinkers have the key to the solution of the problem of the decadence of decay of the concept of the human person that we confront today.

This comparative study between Buber and Madhvācārya has been divided into three major parts and each major part is divided into five chapters each; and the Bibliography is placed at the end.

Vijayak. R.N.

PLACE: MYSORE **R. N. VIJAYA KUMAR**

DATED: 16.11.2002.

Rarest Archiver

CONTENTS

Preface i

Abbreviations xii

PART ONE: MARTIN BUER'S THOUGHT

CHAPTER-1 **Introduction—Life and Works of Martin Buber** 1-25

1.0. Introduction
1.1. The Life of Martin Buber
1.2. The Works of Martin Buber
1.3. Buber's Writings and Method of Writing
1.4. Buber's Life, His Philosophical Writings and Their Significance for Today's World
1.5. The Religious Influences on Martin Buber
1.6. The Influences of Philosophies on Buber
1.7. The Influences of Dilthey and Simmel on Buber

CHAPTER-2 **The Outline of Martin Buber's Philosophy** 26-44
2.0. Introduction
2.1. The Definitions and Themes of Existentialism
2.2. The Existence and the Other
2.3. The Individualism, Collectivism and Community
2.4. The Interpersonal Relation and Relationship
2.5. The Twofold Attitudes of Man: 'I-Thou' And 'I-IT'
2.5.1 The I and Thou
2.5.2 The I and IT
2.6. The Eternal Thou

CHAPTER-3 **The 'I'** 45-77
3.0. Introduction--- The Question and Concept of Man
3.1. The Question—'What is Man'?
3.2. 'What is Man'? —An Analysis in the History of Philosophy
3.3. The Human Person and the Individual
3.4. More Concretely the 'Individual and Person'
3.5. The Concept of 'Person' Through Relationship
3.6. The Sphere of the 'Between' or the 'Interhuman'
3.7. The 'I' more Concretely and the Twofold 'I'
3.8. The I and Thou
3.09. World and I and Thou

Rarest Archiver

3.10. The I and Thou Relationship and Its Characteristics
CHAPTER-4 **The 'THOU'** **78-126**
4.0. Introduction
4.1. The Meaning of 'Thou' (The Other)
4.2. The Inborn Thou
4.3. God the Eternal Thou
4.4. God as Person
4.5. God and Man Relationship
4.6. Biblical Relationship of God and Man
4.7. The Eclipse of the Eternal Thou (God)
4.8. The Criticism of Buber against Kierkegaard's concept of God and man Relationship
4.9. The Relationship of 'I' to 'Thou' and 'Thou' to 'I' (The I-Thou Relationship)
4.10. The I and Thou Relationship in Three spheres
4.11. The I and Thou Relationship and its Structure-Distance and Relationship
4.12. The Characteristics of I and Thou Relationship
4.12.1. Accepting and Confirming the Otherness (Thou)
4.12.2. The Mutuality or Reciprocity of Relationship
4.12.3. The Opening up and Making Present or Everything.
4.12.4. The Relationship of Actuality and Latency
4.12.5. The Relationship of Immediacy and Concreteness
4.12.6. The Exclusiveness of Relationship
4.12.7. The Encompassing or Inclusion of Everything
CHAPTER-5 **The 'IT'** **127-144**
5.0. The Introduction
5.1 The World of I and IT
5.2 The Contrast between the I-Thou and the I-IT
5.3 The Augmentation of the I and IT World Today
5.4 Closing Remarks

PART TWO MADHVA'S DVAITA VEDĀNTA

CHPATER-1 **145-151**
1.0. Introduction
1.1. Hagiography (Predecessors of Madhva)
1.2. Śrī Madhva's Parents and his Birth
1.3. Date and Life of Śrī Madhvācārya
1.4. Madhva as a Writer, Thinker and a Mystic
1.5. Works of Madhva
1.6. The Style of Madhva's Writings
CHAPTER-2 **Dvaita in Outline** **152-250**
2.1. A Background to the Philosophy of Madhvācārya
2.2. Śrī Mdhva's Dvaita Vedānta in summary

Rarest Archiver

2.3. 'Reality' in Madhvācārya
2.4. Orders of Reality
2.5. The Sākṣi
2.6. The Universe
2.7. The Pramāṇas
2.8. Kevala Pramāṇa
2.9. Aṇu Pramāṇas
2.10. Perception
2.11. Mind (Manas)
2.12. Sākṣi (Internal Witness)- The Seventh Sense
2.13. Inference (Anumāna)
2.14. Verbal Testimony (Śabda-Word or Āgama)
2.15. Relative Strength of the Aṇupramāṇas
2.16. Memory—Source of Valid Knowledge
2.17. Doctrine of Sākṣi
2.18. Etymological meaning of Sākṣi
2.19. Sākṣi as the Ultimate Criterion of Truth
2.20. Etymological basis of Madhva's Philosophy
2.21. Metaphysical basis of Madhva's Thought
2.22. Reality and Independence
2.23. Gradation of Realtiy
2.24. Viśēsa and Bhēda
2.25. Bhēda (Difference)
2.26. Causation (Karaṇata)
2.27. Critical appreciation of Madhva's Contribution
2.28. God or Brahman in Madhvācārya
2.28.1. Viṣṇu is Knowledge
2.28.2. Viṣṇu is not Known by perception (Pratyakṣajñāna)
2.28.3. Reasoning and our Knowledge of Viṣṇu
2.28.4. Refutation of the Proofs for the existence of God
2.28.5. The Nature of God
2.28.6. The Oneness of God
2.28.7. The Body of Viṣṇu
2.28.8. Viṣṇu the Ocean of Attributes
2.28.9. Viṣṇu is Sat
2.28.10. Vijñāna of Viṣṇu
2.28.11. Ānanda of Viṣṇu
2.28.12. Aiswarya of Viṣṇu
2.28.13. Viṣṇu is Nitya (Eternal)
2.28.14. Viṣṇu is Svatantra-Independent Reality
2.28.15. Perfection: Similarity and Difference
2.28.16. Inner Simplicity of Visnu and the Multiplicity of Perfections

Rarest Archiver

2.28.17.	Viṣṇu is the Cause of the Origin, Support and Destruction of the World (Universe)
2.28.18.	Refutation of Opposing Views
2.28.19.	Viṣṇu is only Efficient Cause of the World
2.29.	Origination of the World
2.29.1	Viṣṇu is the Supporter and the Ruler of the World
2.29.2	Purpose of Creation
2.29.3	Creation and Use of Sādhanas
2.29.4	Ānanda-Līla of Viṣṇu
2.29.5	Conception of the World in Madhva
2.29.6	Refutation of the Rival Schools
2.29.7	The meaning and Nature of Creation
2.29.8	'Eternal Creation' Thro' Parādhīnaviśeṣāpti
2.29.9	Meaning of the Doctrine of Parādhīnaviśeṣāpti
2.29.10	Critique of Brahma-Pariṇāmavāda and Vivarta-Vāda
2.29.11	Critique of Vivarta-Vāda
2.29.12	The Dvaita theory of Sad-Asat-Kārya-Vāda
2.29.13	Viṣṇu and the Instruments (Sādhanas) used in Creation
2.29.14	Madhva's theory of the Evolution of the World
2.29.15	The Process of Evolution and Involution
2.29.16	The reality of the World
2.29.17	Viṣṇu and Sustenance (Sthiti) Ruling (Niyati) and Dissolution (Pralaya) of the World.
2.30.	The Anthropology or the Conception of man
2.30.1	The Nature of the Soul (Jīva-Svarūpa)
2.30.2	The Soul is different from God and Matter
2.30.3	The Soul's Relation to Viṣṇu
2.30.4	The Complete distinction between Viṣṇu and the Souls
2.30.5	The Self as the knower, doer and enjoyer
2.30.6	The Soul (Jīvātman) and Body.
2.30.7	The reason for the Union of Soul and Matter
2.30.8	Man's birth and death
2.30.9	Plurality of Souls (Selves) is Intrinsic
2.30.10	Svarūpa-Traividhyam (The Threefold Hierarchy of Souls)
2.30.11	The Problem of Evil
2.30.12	Sin (Pāpa), Evil conduct (Adharma) and Evil (Doṣa)
2.31.	Viṣṇu and the last destiny of man
2.31.1.	The Source and nature of Bondage (Bandha)
2.31.2.	The Source and Nature of Liberation (Mukti or Mokṣa)
2.31.3.	Viṣṇu the Giver of Liberation
2.31.4.	'Liberation' in Madhva
2.31.5.	Means to reach Liberation (Sādhanavicāra)

Rarest Archiver

2.31.6. The Way of Devotion (Bhaktimārga)
2.31.7. The Favour of Viṣṇu (Prasāda)
2.31.8. The Function of the saving favour of Viṣṇu
2.31.9. The Status or the Condition of the Released Souls
CHPATER-3 **The Conception of Brahman as 'Eternal Thou' (Purushottama-Supreme)** **251-261**
3.0. Introduction
3.1. Madhva's Philosophy of God
3.2. The Nature of God
3.2.1 Definition of God or Brahman
3.2.2 Brahman-Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇ
3.3. Viṣṇu is the Central teaching of Vēda
3.4. Viṣṇu is the Śruti-Centred
3.5. The Sacred Texts (Sadāgamas)
3.6. Attributes of Viṣṇu
3.6.1 Viṣṇu is Being (Sat, Satyam)
3.6.2 Viṣṇu is Knowledge (Jñānam, Vijñānam)
3.6.3 The Bliss of Viṣṇu (Ānanda)
3.7. Viṣṇu is Eternal (Nitya) and Omnipresent (Sarvagata)
3.8. The Lordship of Viṣṇu (Aiśvarya)
3.9. Viṣṇu is the Indestructible and all Pervasive
3.10. Viṣṇu is Invisible and has Unique Power (Avyakta and Achintya)
3.11. Viṣṇu is the Supreme Being and all others entirely dependent on Him
3.12. Viṣṇu supports all, Is everywhere, He is Supreme and He is realized by devotion
3.13. Viṣṇu is all Pervasive but Invisible
3.14. Viṣṇu imparts to all
3.15. Viṣṇu is the Knower of all and He is present at the Heart of all beings
3.16. Viṣṇu is the Cause of Memory, Understanding and Illusion; He is the Author of Vēdas and Brahmasūtras; all Vēdas Convey Him
3.17. Is Viṣṇu Personal God?
3.18. Viṣṇu is Kṣetra and Kṣetrajña
CHAPTER-4 **The Jīvātmas (Thous-Souls)** **262-278**
4.0 Introduction
4.1. Nature of Man (The definition of Jiva)
4.2. Essence of Selfhood
4.3. The Body of Man
4.4. Man the Composite being
4.5. The Soul is atomic in size
4.6. The Self (Jīva) as the Knower, Doer and Enjoyer
4.7. Plurality of Souls and their Svarūpa-Bhēda and Svarupa-Visesas

Rarest Archiver

4.8.	The Threefold Hierarchy of Jivas-Svarupa-Traividhyam	
4.9.	Gods and Demons	
4.10.	The Relational basis for the doctrine of Svarūpabhēda Taratamya and Traividhya	
4.11.	Self-luminosity of Jīvas	
4.12.	Jīva-Viṣṇu relation	
4.13.	The Complete distinction between Viṣṇu and the Jīvas	
4.14.	The Jīva's difference from God and matter	
4.15.	Jīvātman and the body or Jīvas and bodies	
4.16.	The union of Jīva and matter	
4.17.	Theory of bondage of Jīvas(Svabhāvajñānavāda)	
4.18.	Doctrine of Salvation-Viṣṇu is the giver of Liberation	
4.19.	Liberation in Madhva	
4.20.	Problem of Evil in Madhva	
4.21.	Criticism of Madhva theory of the problem of evil	
4.22.	Our critical appreciation of Madhva Dvaita	
CHAPTER-5	**The World-Jagat**	**279-287**
5.0.	General Introduction	
5.1	Reality of the World Experience	
5.2	Viṣṇu, the Cause of the Origin, Support and Destination of the World	
5.3	The meaning and nature of Creation	
5.4	The doctrine of Parādhīna-Viśeṣāpti	
5.4.1.	Substantial change (Abhutva Bhāvanam)	
5.4.2.	Parādhīnaviśeṣāpti	
5.5.	Viṣṇu is only the Efficient Cause and not the material Cause of the World	
5.6.	The theory of Sad-Asat-Kārya-vāda in Dvaita	
5.7.	The purpose of Creation (Sṛṣṭi)	
5.8.	Evolution of the World in Madhva	
5.9.	Viṣṇu and the Reality of the World	
5.10.	Viṣṇu-Dissolution (Reabsorption) (Pralaya) of the World	
5.11.	The ages of the World	
5.12.	Creation and the use of Sādhanas (instruments)	
	PART THREE –COMPARISION AND CONTRAST	
	INTRODUCTION	
	General Outline of the Comparison of Philosophical Concepts of Martin Buber and Śrī Madhvācārya	**288-292**
CHAPTER-1	Comparison of 'THOU' (Eternal Thou) and 'Brahman' (Viṣṇu)	**293-365**

Rarest Archiver

1.0	Introduction
1.1.	The Clarification and the meaning of 'Thou' (The Other)
1.1.1	The Summary of 'Thou'
1.2.	The 'Eternal Thou' and Brahman (Viṣṇu): The Existence and the Knowledge of God-Bible and Śruti oriented approaches in Buber and Madhva
1.3.	The Concept of God—Similarities of approach in Buber and Madhva
1.4.	For the Existence of God the Rational Proofs are not end or conclusive in Buber and Madhva
1.5.	Only Scriptures (Revelation) give us the Suprasensible Knowledge of God—Buber and Madhva
1.6.	The Scriptures (Bible, Śruti) are above reason and they are non-contrary to each other—Buber and Madhva
1.7.	Scripture (Bible-Revelation-Āgama) and reason (Rationality-Anumāna) complement each other—Buber and Madhva
1.8.	Proofs (Rational) for the Existence of God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu)—Buber and Madhva
1.9.	The Existence of God through the Cosmological argument (or God as the First Cause of the World)—Buber and Madhva
1.10.	Degree of Perfection in the Eternal Thou and Brahman (Viṣṇu)—Buber and Madhva
1.11.	Teleological argument or the Order in the Universe because of the Eternal Thou—Viṣṇu Acc. to Buber and Madhva
1.12.	Proof for God's Existence through the moral law argument—Buber and Madhva
1.13.	Our Knowledge of God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu)—Buber and Madhva
1.13.1.	The Nature of God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu)--- Buber and Madhva
1.13.2.	The limitation of our knowledge and the knowledge of Eternal Thou and Viṣṇu (God)—Buber and Madhva
1.13.3.	Human ways of knowing the nature of the Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu (God)—Buber and Madhva
1.13.4.	The Human ways of expressing the knowledge of the Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu(God)—Buber and Madhva
1.14.	Likeness or Parallelism (Analogical) Predestination of God—Buber and Madhva
1.15.	The Body of the Eternal Thou and Viṣṇu—Buber and Madhva
1.16.	The Eternal Thou and Viṣṇu are Saguṇa (With Attributes) and Saviśeṣa (Qualified) personality—Buber and Madhva
1.17.	The Attributes of the Eternal Thou and Viṣṇu—Buber and Madhva
1.18.	The Unity of the Eternal Thou and Viṣṇu—Buber and Madhva
1.19.	The concept of Independence of the Eternal Thou and Viṣṇu—Buber and Madhva

Rarest Archiver

1.20. The knowledge and will of the Eternal Thou and Viṣṇu—Buber and Madhva
1.21. The Eternal Thou Viṣṇu is Person—Buber and Madhva
1.22. The relation of God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) to His Attributes --- Buber and Madhva
1.23. The concept of the Incarnation and the Avatāras of the Eternal Thou and Viṣṇu—Buber and Madhva
1.24. The relationship of the Eternal Thou and Viṣṇu to the World—Buber and Madhva
1.25. The relationship of the Eternal Thou and Viṣṇu to Souls (Jīvas) --- Buber and Madhva
1.26. Contributions of Buber and Madhva in the concept of God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu)

CHAPTER-2 **Comparison of 'I' and 'Jīva'** **366-394**

2.0. Introduction: On the concept of Man
2.1 The Meaning 'I' in Buber
2.2 The Nature of 'I' and 'Jīva'—Buber and Madhva
2.3 The Union of Body and Soul (I-Jīva)- in Man –Buber and Madhva
2.4 The Plurality and Hierarchy of I-Jīva (of Beings)—Buber and Madhva
2.5 The 'I'-'Jīva' and 'God' (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu)—Buber and Madhva
2.6 The Problem of Evil—Buber and Madhva
2.7 Cause of Evil---Buber and Madhva
2.8 The 'I'-'Jīva' (Man) and the World ---Buber and Madhva
2.9 The Existence of I-Jīva (Man) in the Universe—Buber and Madhva
2.10 I-Jīva (Man)and Society—Buber and Madhva
2.11 'I-Jīva' (Man) in the Universe—Buber and Madhva
2.12 'I-Jīva's' (Man's) Last Destiny ---Buber and Madhva
2.13 The Source and Nature of I-Jīva's Bondage (Bandha)—Buber and Madhva
2.14 The Source and Nature of the Liberation of I-Jīva---Buber and Madhva
2.15 The Nature of Liberation—Redemption of I-Jīva
2.16 The Means of Liberation-Redemption of I-Jīva—Buber and Madhva
2.17 Life of I-Jīva beyond Death—Eschatology---Buber and Madhva
2.18 The Journey of the I-Jīva after death---Buber and Madhva
2.19 The Predestination of I-Jīva---Buber and Madhva

CHAPTER-3 **Comparison of 'IT' and 'Jagat'** **395-416**

3.1 Conception of the World—Buber and Madhva
3.2 The Reality of the World Experience—Buber and Madhva
3.3 The Meaning and Nature of Creation (Sṛsti) of the World—Buber and Madhva
3.4 Creation Out of Not-Yet-Being and Parādhīna-Viśēṣāpti—Buber and Madhva

Rarest Archiver

3.5 The Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu and the Reality of the World-- Buber and Madhva
3.6 God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) the Cause of the Origin, Support, Ruling and Destruction (Pralaya) of the World-- Buber and Madhva
3.7 God as the Sustainer (Sthiti), Ruler (Niyati) and Destroyer (Pralaya) of the Wrold-- Buber and Madhva
3.8 The Purpose, Motive, Utility (Prayōjana) of Creation--- Buber and Madhva
3.9 Creation in Time-Eternity and Eternal Creation—Buber and Madhva
3.10 God and Sādhanas (Instruments) used in Creation-- Buber and Madhva
3.11 Man's Relationship to the World-- Buber and Madhva

CHAPTER-4 **Inter-Relationship among 'Thou' (Brahman), 'I'(Jīva) and 'IT' (Jagat)** **417-440**

4.0 Introduction
4.1. The Plurality and Hierarchy of I-Jīva (of beings)---Buber and Madhva
4.2. The 'I-Jīva' and God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu)—Buber and Madhva
4.3. The Problem of Evil—Buber and Madhva
4.4. The Inter-Relationship among 'I-Jīva' and the I-Jagat—Buber and Madhva
4.5. The I-Jīva (Man) exist in the IT-Jagat (World)—Buber and Madhva
4.6. The Eternal Thou—Brahman—Viṣṇu and I-Jīva (Man) and Society—Buber and Madhva
4.7. I-Jīva's (Man's) last Destiny –Buber and Madhva
4.8. The Means of Liberation—Redemption of I-Jīva—Buber and Madhva
4.9. Life of I-Jīva Beyond Death—Eschatology—Buber and Madhva
4.10. The Journey of the I-Jīva after Death---Buber and Madhva
4.11. The Predestination of I-Jīva—Buber and Madhva
4.12. Conclusion

CHAPTER-5 **The Critical Estimation** **441-461**

5.1. Introduction
5.2 The 'Relationship' and the 'Epistemology'—Buber and Madhva
5.3 Buber's Contribution
5.4 The Critical Evaluations on Madhva System
5.5 Conclusions

BIBLIOGRAPHY 462

Rarest Archiver

ABBREVIATIONS

PRIMARY SOURCES

MARTIN BUBER

BMM:	Between Man and Man.
EG :	Eclipse of God
KM :	The Knowledge of Man
IT :	I and Thou
PMB:	The Philosophy of Martin Buber

ŚRĪ MADHVĀCĀRYA

AV.	Anuvyākhyana
Bhāg.Pu.	Bhāgavat Purāṇa
Bh.Gī.	Bhagavadgīta
Bh. Gī. Bh.	Bhagavadgīta Bhāṣya
Brh.Up.	Bṛhadaraṇyaka Upaniṣad
Brh.Up. Bh.	Bṛhadaraṇyaka Upaniṣad Bhāṣya
BS.Bh.	Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya
B.T.	Bhāgavata Tātparya
Ch.Up.	Chāndogya Upaniṣad
GB.	Gīta Bhāṣya
GT.	Gīta Tātparya
Is.Up.	Īśopaniṣad
Is.Up.Bh.	Īśopaniṣad Bhāṣya
Kath.Up.	Kaṭhopaniṣad
Kath. Up.Bh.	Kaṭhopaniṣad Bhāṣya
KN.	Karma Nirṇaya
Mbh.	Mahābhārata
Mund.Up.Bh.	Muṇḍakopaniṣad Bhāṣya
NS.	Nyāya Sudhā
Pr.Dī	Prameya Dīpikā
Prl.	Pramāṇalakṣana
Prl.Tī.	Pramāṇalakṣana Tīka
Rg.V.	Ṛg vēda
Śvet.Up.	Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad
Tait.Up.	Taittirīya Upaniṣad
Tat.Di.	Tattva Dīpikā
TP.	Tattvaprkāśika
TV.	Tattva Vivēka

Rarest Archiver

VTV.	Viṣṇutattvavinirṇaya
VTV.Ṭī.	Viṣṇutattvavinirṇaya Ṭīka

SECONDARY SOURCES

Glasenapp, Viṣṇu Faith	Helmuth Von Glasenapp, Madhva's Philosophy of the Viṣṇu Faith
Puthiadam, God	I.Puthiadam, God in the thought of St.Thomas and Śrī Madhvācārya
Puthiadam, Viṣṇu	I.Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free
Sharma, Philosophy	B.N.K. Sharma Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya
Sharma, Teaching	B.N.K. Sharma, Madhva's Teachings in his own Words

Rarest Archiver

PART ONE

MARTIN BUBER'S THOUGHT

Rarest Archiver

MARTIN BUBER'S THOUGHT

CHAPTER -- 1

1.0. Introduction

Martin Buber was a Jewish-German existential philosopher; and as a theologian and a Biblical translator, he was said to be one of the most influential figures in the twentieth century intellectual- spiritual life. Many leading philosophers and scholars compare him with the great figures of German Jewry and especially with the eighteenth century great figure Moses Mendelssohn.[1]

There were two major problems such as, the impasse between life and spirit that confronted the philosophical thought of the twentieth century. These problems were also rooted in the subject-object dichotomy. Martin Buber, while confronting these problems from his own personal struggles and perspectives, introduced the 'presence' which he calls the 'I-Thou' relationship; and further, he terms the ontically prior relation of the presence as the sphere of the 'Between' (Das Zwischen).[2] He believes that through the sphere of the 'Between', the I-Thou relationship binds life and spirit. His main concern is not to elaborate a philosophical system or to put forth few of the solutions to epistemological or ethical problems but to build and carry out the I-Thou relationship with his partner, the reality that was forgotten and went unnoticed. It is from the concept of the reality of I-Thou relationship, Buber further directed his concern towards the encounter of man with man, with God and with his world. Maurice Friedman, an outstanding interpreter of Martin Buber rightly

---

[1].Micorpaedia, Encyclopedia, p.358.

[2].Martin Buber, Between Man and Man, trans. R.G. Smith (London & Glasgow: Collins, The Fontana Library, 1961), pp. 244-245. Hereafter cited as BMM.

Rarest Archiver

calls Buber as the philosophical anthropologist because Buber gave more importance to interpersonal relationship and practical life of human beings.

The principle of I-Thou and its opposition I-IT is the first thought that occurs to our mind at the mention of Buber's name. The categories of I-Thou and I-IT are the summary of his existential philosophy. With the categories of I-Thou and I-IT, he is said to have revolutionized the contemporary Jewish and Christian religious philosophy. His philosophy of I-Thou and I-IT has great implications on psychology, education, ethics and social sciences. The philosophical concepts and imageries of Buber have become the part of intellectual fields and their repercussions are flowing in the philosophical and religious thoughts of our times. The influence of Buber's I-Thou philosophy on the theory of knowledge, psychology, philosophy, history, religion, Biblical faith, Theology, Christianity and Judaism is incomparable.

According to Buber himself the term 'philosophy of existence' appears to be very imprecise and unsteady conceptual term, and therefore he does not want to be called himself as an existential philosopher. Further, Buber does not belong to any of the philosophical schools or systems unless and otherwise they fall into the arena of his I-Thou philosophical anthropology.

Though Buber is not an academic philosopher or professional theologian, yet we find that he uses the language of these disciplines to present his idea very clearly. Hence many eminent scholars and leading philosophers of today including Reinhold Niebuhr maintain that Buber is the best-known Jewish philosopher and theologian of the twentieth century. In the words of Charles Hartshorne, though Buber has no metaphysics, yet he is one of the greatest of

Rarest Archiver

metaphysicians. Buber is called as the great philosopher, a consummate poet and a world famous scholar; and professor Friedman calls him as a genius with an inexhaustible store of creativity.

Before we embark in dealing with Buber's I-Thou philosophy in detail and its lasting influence in modern intellectual and philosophical fields, it is appropriate here to glance in summary through his life and works in this first chapter of the Thesis. Buber's life and works emphasize the meetings on the difficult and narrow ridge of human history and his own personal life. It is out of the narrow ridge of history and personal life that Buber's thought, his image of the human and many of his great interpretations grew.[3]

1.1. THE LIFE OF MARTIN BUBER:

It is a fact that there are few personalities in the twentieth century who have left such a lasting and profound mark on the philosophical thought of our age as has the existential philosopher Martin Buber. Buber is compared with Mahatma Gandhi, Albert Schweitzer and Einstein and he is widely accepted as one of the truly universal men of our times.

MORDECAI MARTIN BUBER was born on February 8, 1878, in Vienna, Austria to Carl Buber, an agronomist and Elise Buber nee Wurgast, both famous Galician Rabbinical Jews. When Martin Buber was three, his mother literally disappeared from home without leaving a trace. However, only later it was discovered that she had gone to Russia and had remarried there. Because of his mother's disappearance, Buber's home of childhood was broken up and he underwent depression, bereavement and mourning throughout his youthful days. After this tragic scene of his mother's disappearance, Buber was sent to live with his grand

---

[3]. Maurice Friedman, *Martin Buber's Life and Work*, (Search Press, 1982), Pre., xvii.

Rarest Archiver

parents Solomon Buber and Adele Buber in Lumbago (now Lovov, Ukrainian S.S.R) in Galicia.

Solomon Buber, the grand father of Buber was a businessman and a wealthy philanthropist and his grand mother Adele was said to be product of the 19th century enlightenment movement of the East European Jewry. Buber's grandparents did not send him to school until he was ten years old and instead he was taught humanism and languages by the private tutors. His own inclinations and talents lay in the learning direction of humanism with the special stress upon the languages that was thought to be the royal road to education. In his grand parent's house what predominated was the German language and later Buber owed his special relation to German language to his grand parents and especially to his grand mother. One of the favorite languages of Buber as a child was Greek and later his philosophical education was well established in particular on through reading of Plato in Greek. Buber spoke many languages, i.e., German, Polish, Hebrew, Yiddish, French, Italian, Spanish, Greek, Latin, Dutch and English etc.[5]

The grand parents of Buber taught him the true love of reading and language and introduced him to the world of scholarship. The strong scholarly foundation at the grandparents' home atmosphere helped Buber to the task of Hebrew translation that occupied his throughout his life. Besides all these scholarly training, Buber was also introduced to the Wisdom literature of Bible and was educated in the rich spiritual traditions and piety of Judaism. Buber spent his summer months with his family in Sadagora and Czortkov villages and he came into contact with the Hasidism for the first time there. The life and practices of Galician Jewish Hasidic

---

4. Ibid. pp.3-4.
5. Ibid. pp.7-8.

Rarest Archiver

communities influenced enormously the life and writings of Buber.

Martin Buber saw his mother only once again and from the ninth year on Carl Buber his father reentered his life; and during every summer the boy Buber went to join his father and his stepmother who was married to Carl Buber with the permission of the rabbinical court of Lovov. Buber had gone back to live with his father at the age of fourteen.

The lasting influence of Carl Buber on his son Buber was not an intellectual one but his devotion to agriculture that made him an impressive phenomenon among the East Galician landed property owners. What struck Buber was his father's practical and exemplary farming with the combination of scientific methods and religious outlook. Carl Buber's direct and individual concern for his animals and plants with which he worked his I-Thou relationship with nature and laborers made an enormous influence on Buber who could not have learnt from any book. Hence, writing about Carl Buber, Maurice Friedman says, "This wholly unsentimental and wholly unromantic man was concerned about genuine human contact with nature, an active and responsible contact. In his own person, Carl Buber anticipated one of the most fundamental aspects of his son's later thoughts: that the man who practices immediacy does so in relation to nature just as much as to his fellowman- the 'I-Thou' relation to nature is a corollary of the 'interhuman".[6] It was said about Buber that he was an elemental storyteller especially of retelling Hasidic and other legends and this he developed significantly because of his father.

Buber entered the University of Vienna at the age of 18 in 1896 and studied philosophy, literature and history of art.

---

[6]. Ibid. p.12.

Rarest Archiver

Later he moved on to the university of Berlin as pupil and was deeply influenced by the famous philosophers such as, Wilhelm Dilthey and George Simmel. He received his doctorate from the university of Berlin in the year 1904 for his doctoral thesis a theme from mysticism, 'Zur Geschichete des Individuations-problems- Nikolaus Von Cues Und Jacob Boehme'. The doctoral thesis of Buber was thought to be part of a greater volume that was expected to be dealt with the problem of individuation from Aristotle to Leibniz. Besides the above-mentioned universities, Buber also studied at the universities of Leipzig and Zurich. He married a brilliant German student Paula Winker, a native of Munich.[7]

Buber was deeply influenced by the giants of German idealism, romanticism and the German mystics like Meister Eckhart and Jacob Boheme from the early days of his university life. But those who meant to him most of his intellectual relations were the 19th century philosophers such as Feuerbach, Kierkegaard, Dostojevsky and Nietzsche. Other factors and personalities that affected his thinking to a great extent were Marx, Proudhon and especially his close friend Landauer.

Poetess Else Lasker Schuler described Buber's beard as the 'Moses Mouth', which Buber wore from his youth. The real reason for his beard was that the doctor had delivered him by the use of forceps and thereby he received an injury at the right side of his mouth. Buber was exceptionally handsome youth but this injury produced a disfigurement, which he covered by the beard.[8] In 1898 Buber joined the Zionist movement and in 1901 he was appointed as the editor of 'Die Welt', the central weekly organ of Zionist movement; and in 1902 together with his friends he

---

7. Francis J. Lescoe, *Existentialism- With or Without God*, p.134.
8. Maurice Friedman, Op Cit.. p.9.

Rarest Archiver

founded the 'Juedicher Verlag' in Berlin that went on publishing in German books of literary quality and they were available to Jewry throughout central Europe. It was in 1916 Buber founded 'Der Jude', the German Jewish monthly which was the most respected and literate voice of German Jewry until 1924.[9] Buber took up Hasidism at the age of 26 and attempted to translate the tales of Rabbi Nahman of Bratslav in German and later with his free adaptation method he decided to retell them in German. Thus originated 'The tales of Rabbi' in 1906 and the 'The legend of Ball-Shem' in 1908. in 1909, Buber resumed active roles in public affairs and delivered three important addresses to Prag student organization in 1909,1910 and 1911 which greatly influenced the central European Jewish Youth. These three important addresses also marked a turning point in the intellectual activities of Buber. He founded the 'Jewish National Committee' in Berlin during the outbreak of World War I and this committee worked throughout the world war on behalf of the Jews in Palestine and the Eastern European countries, which were under the German occupation. In 1916, Buber founded another monthly, 'Der Jude' which was the most important organ of the Jewish renaissance movement in Central Europe for almost eight years.

In 1923, Buber went to Frankfurt-am-Main- University and from 1924 until 1933 he lectured in the same university on Jewish religion and ethics. The Frankfurt University was the only chair in Jewish religion in any of the German universities. In 1933 though the Nazis rose to power and they removed him from his professorship, he staunchly remained in Germany for another five years by giving spiritual inspiration

---

Michael Wyschogrod, '*The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 1&2, pp.137-38

Rarest Archiver

and leadership to his hard pressed and suffering people during those dark days of Buchenwald and Auswitch.[10]

Buber was appointed as the director of the newly created central office for Jewish Adult education in 1933 because in those gruesome days of Nazis, the Jews were prohibited from attending German educational institutions. In 1935 Buber was forbidden to speak at the Jewish gathering and later in 1938, at the age of sixty he went to Palestine and was appointed professor of social philosophy in the Hebrew university of Jerusalem. He taught social philosophy in the same Hebrew university of Jerusalem till 1951 until the age of seventy-three of his retirement.[11] After his retirement Buber was very active in public affairs and Jewish cultural activities and was said to be one of the leaders of Ihud that advocated the establishment of the Arab-Israel state. During the outbreak of Arab-Israel war, Buber strove for the harnessing of nationalistic impulses and compromise solutions.

Buber lectured extensively outside Israel in the years following World War II and visited the United States in the years 1952, 1957 and 1958. He became much known throughout the world as one of the spiritual leaders of his generation while making a deep influence and enormous impact on Jewish and Christian thinkers. Buber became the first president of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities from 1960 to 1962.[12] He constantly strove for a genuine cultural Zionism and was firmly convinced that only solution to the Palestine question was a peaceful Arab-Jewish co-existence.[13]

---

10. Francis J. Lescoe, Op.Cit.,pp.137-138.
11. Micorpaedia, *The New Encyclopedia Britannica* Dictionary,
12. The Encyclopedia Judaica, *The Encyclopedia Judaica Jerusalem*, p. 1432.
13. Francis J. Lescoe, Op. Cit., p.138.

Rarest Archiver

Wherever Buber went, he drew admiring audiences like Protestant, Catholics and Jewish scholars; and the students from different walks of life flocked to hear his discourses on community, relation and words of love. In 1917, 'The Seventh Day' was published by a group of Kibbutz members shortly after the six-day war between Arab and Israel that testifies to the living spirit of Buber who worked strenuously on the attitude of ethical question of war and peace between Arab and Jewish relations. Buber breathed his last on June 13, 1965 at the age of 87; and at his funeral in Jerusalem a high state function was held in his honor for he struggled hard for peace between Israel and Palestine, the two poles of people who fight even to this day.[14]

1.2. THE WORKS OF MARTIN BUBER.

Martin Buber's works are the outcome of his personal response to all the events and meetings of his life. He strongly emphasized on the concrete, historical and unique human condition; and the abstract analysis of the human condition of philosophical anthropology is a rare factor to be found in his works. In the words of Maurice Friedman, one of the outstanding interpretators of Buber, ' Martin Buber's Works emphasizes the meetings on the narrow ridge of history and personal life out of which grew his thought, his image of the human, and his great interpretations'. All most all his works, even his translations of Hebrew Bible and his retelling of Hasidic tales are to be understood as the words addressed to the time. His works grew out of situations and they speak to the situations. Maurice Friedman mentions of Arnold Jacob Wolf who had put these words at the New York Buber Centennial

---

[14]. Micorpaedia, Encyclopedia, Vol.II, p. 360.

Rarest Archiver

Conference as, "More than anyone else writing in the first half of our century, perhaps Buber addresses our own situation".[15]

Buber was a famous scholar of the Bible and Hasidism and as a great philosopher he almost single handedly made the Jewish mysticism a part of the Western heritage. Buber's inexhaustible store of creativity produced treasury of Books, poems, essays, a play and a novel. He was a wise man and said to be one of the most learned men of his time. As a universal scholar, he had an amazing command of languages and disciplines of philosophical knowledge. The writings of Buber are indeed great and their greatness can be grasped only in relation to Buber himself.

Martin Buber wrote prolifically during his long life and numerous works flowed from him during more than sixty years of his life. There have been distinct stages in the development of his philosophical writings from the year 1900 to his death in June 1965. The writings of Buber can be put under three stages. The first stage of his writings consists the period of mysticism and the wirings of Hasidic teachings; and the teaching of Tao are said to be the great contributions of this period. His philosophy of orientation and realization in the work called, 'Daniel' and his famous philosophy of relation in his important book called, 'Ich und Du' (I and THOU) come under the second stage of the period. The third and final stage of his philosophical thought is the period of philosophical anthropology. However small they are, his philosophical works consist the themes of relational structure of human existence.

Few of the critics maintain that Buber's works, because of their extraordinary complexity, are not philosophically structured and systematic; and many points remain obscure to

---

[15]. Maurice Friedman, Op. Cit., p.xvii.

Rarest Archiver

the reader as they are more descriptive and have the character of essays. Some of his works are poetic in style differing from to another.

While the first philosophical book of Buber was 'Daniel', 'Ich und Du'- I and Thou' was his famous work which was first drafted in 1916 and finally published in 1923; and later it was thought to be put in to five volumes. The 'Ich und Du' is aphoristic poetry that is presented in three parts and it consists Buber's classical theory of I-Thou relationship. The language of the work is philosophical and the tone sometimes poetical. Though at times the works seems to quiver of what cannot be expressed, the philosophical reader really understands the content of it. Many leading philosophers, theologians and scholars have accepted that the 'Ich und Du' is the most inspired work ever written on I-Thou relationship between Divine-Human and Nature in the history of mankind. Though at first sight the 'Ich und Du' seems to be striving without philosophical perfection, it contains Buber's central thoughts of I-Thou relationship and of interpersonal existence of various directions and aspects of human life and life of other beings.

The attentive reading of this work will nevertheless manifest to the reader the amazing creativity, originality and competence of Buber with which he handled this unique theme in every page of his work with his profound intuition and illuminative insights. According to Buber himself, his 'Ich und Du' includes and gathers all the further stage of his philosophical developments; and it includes all the philosophical insights that would be better developed in his later writings.[16]

---

[16]. Martin Buber, IT, 'Postscript', (1958), pp.123-24.

Rarest Archiver

In his 'Between Man and Man', Buber mentions that after the publication of 'Ich und Du', his philosophical concern was to complete and fill up with many clarifications about the various aspects of I-Thou relationship and interhuman existential principles and insights that are beforehand enumerated in the work.[17] In one of his small works entitled, 'The Question to the single One' and in the work called, 'Between Man and Man', Buber strongly criticizes Kierkegaard's doctrine called the exclusive relationship between the Single One and God. This type of relationship by its very nature puts aside all other relations inclusive of the relationship between two persons.[18]

Buber's lectures on social philosophy at the Hebrew university of Jerusalem were published under the title,' What is Man?' in which he discusses more critically the problem of man. Through analytical and historical methods, he arrives to the conclusion that the essence of human being consists in the most fundamental reality of I-Thou relational structure of 'between two persons'. 'The distance and relation' and 'The Word that is spoken' were the last important stages in the scientific development of Buber's philosophical anthropology in which the ontological reality of the philosophy of the 'Between' as the reality of the interhuman existence is more emphasized. Under the title, 'The Knowledge of Man' the above contributions and essays of Buber on the same theme of I-Thou relationship were published in English.[19]

Maurice Friedman comments that all the works and essays of Buber represent his most systematic development of

---

17. Martin Buber, BMM, Op.Cit., p.15.
18. Ibid., pp. 106-108.
19 Cf. Martin Buber, The Knowledge of Man, ed. With an Intro. Maurice Friedman (New York: Harper Torchbooks 1965). Hereafter it will be cited as KM.

Rarest Archiver

philosophical anthropology in the history of philosophy; and his theory of relation is well portrayed in all his works and essays. All the works and essays stand as the culmination and crown of Buber's ontology, philosophical anthropology and epistemology.[20]

Maurice Friedman, an outstanding interpretator of Martin Buber has beautifully compiled all the works of Buber in English translations. They are the following: "Adult Education," Torah; Arab - Jewish Unity. (Testimony before the Anglo - American Inquiry Commission for the Ihud (Union) Association by Judah Magnes and Martin Buber); At the Turning. Three Addresses on Judaism; The beginning of the National Idea. " Review of Religion, X (1945- 1946); Between Man and Man. Trans. Ronald Gregor Smith (Includes 'Relation,' 'The Question to the Single One,' ' Education of Character' and ' What is Man?'); "Distance and Relation. "(Tr. Ronald Gregor Smith. Psychiatry, xx, no. 2, May 1957); Eclipse of God. Studies in the Relation between Religion and Philosophy. (Tr. Maurice S. Friedman et al., 1952, 1957), For the Sake of Heaven. (Tr. Ludwig Lewisohn. Philadelphia: 1945, 1953, 1958.); Good and Evil. Two Interpretations. (Includes Right and Wrong and Images of Good and Evil, 1953); Hasidism. 1949; "Hope for This Hour," (Address given in English at Carnegie Hall, New York City, April 6, 1952. World Review, Dec. 19520;Ponting the Way; I and Thou, 2nd Ed. With Postscript by Author. Tr. Ronald Gregor Smith, 1950. ; I and Thou. Tr. Walter Kaufmann. 1970; Images of Good and Evil. 1952; Israel and Palestine. The History of an Idea, 1952. ; Israel and World. Essays in a Time of Crisis, 1948. ; The Legend of Baal - Shem, 1953; " Letters to Franz Rosenzweig on the Law' in Franz Rosenzweig, On Jewish

---

[20]. Maurice. Friedman," Introductory Essay", in Martin Buber, KM, pp.11-12.

Rarest Archiver

Education, 1954;Mamre. Essays in Religion. 1946; " Myth in Judaism. " 1950; " On the Suspension of the Ethical. " Tr. Maurice S. Friedman. Moral Principles of Action, 1952,' " Our Reply, " Towards Union in Palestine, Essays on Zionism and Jewish - Arab Cooperation. Ed. Martin Buber, Udas Magnes and Ernst Sicon. Jerusalem: Ihud Association, 1945. ' Moses. 1946, 1958; "A New Venture in Adult Education. " The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, April 1950; Paths in Utopia. 1949, 1958. ; Pointing the Way: Collected Essays. 1957; "Remarks on Goethe's Concept of Humanity. " and the Modern Age. 1950. Right and Wrong, An Interpretation of Some Psalms. 1952; "Society and the State. " World Review, 1951. ; Tales of the Hasidism. The Later Masters. 1948. Ten Rungs. Hasidic Sayings. 1947; Two Letters to Gandhi. With Judah Magnes and including public letters by Buber and Magnes and the original text of Gandhi's statement about the Jews in Harijan, Nov. 26. 1938. Pamphlets of the Bond. Jerusalem: April 1939; Two Types of Faith. 1951, 1952; The Way of Man, According to the Teachings of Hasidism1950; Hasidism and Modern Man, Bk. IV.[21]

1.3. BUBER'S WRITINGS AND METHOD OF WRITING:

Buber renounced all systems and thus we find that there are many questionless statements in his writings and there seems to be no clear philosophical method in his writings. It was towards the end of the period of his works he followed the phenomenological method. His thoughts are not the outcome from the abstract thinking but from the personal experiences and the life he lived. Thus we cannot expect rational evidences and philosophical proofs from him. Though he does not claim to present a neat and well structured exposition of his

---

Francis J. Lescoe, Op. Cit., pp.138-40.

Rarest Archiver

principles, yet in his thought procedure, one finds an austere simplicity and centrality.

In his opinion, the doctrine of I-Thou cannot be classified or subjected to any type of rigid structures of systems. He maintains that there does not exist an I-Thou knowledge that can be held fast to or preserved or tactfully transmitted.[22]

According to Buber, the I-Thou relationship can only be transmitted through the sphere of I-IT, thus there' is the paradox to express of what cannot be expressed and cannot be thought of what cannot be thinkable. The writings of Buber are such that a reader or hearer naturally is led to respond to his address of I-Thou relationship, which by its very nature is I-Thou relationship. Thus, Buber opines that everyone has an 'inborn Thou' and has natural capacity to enter into I-Thou relationship that cannot be lost. His own words are, "In the beginning is relation—as category of being, readiness, grasping form, mould for the soul; it is the a priori of relation, the inborn Thou". [23]

His main concern is with the meeting of person and not with the intellect alone. Very often Buber creates his own terminologies and does not stick on to them; and there is a change of terminology in his method from one to another work and he changes them from one work to another. Thus we find in Buber the most important expressions like, "Relationship', 'Person', 'Experience', 'Making Present', 'Religious experience', etc, which do not have the same meaning throughout the exposition of his works. And further he often uses the

---

[22]. Martin Buber, 'Replies to my Critics' in Schilpp,PMB,(1963), pp. 692-93

[23]. Martin Buber, I and Thou, Trans. R.G. Smith, (T&T CLARK EDINBURGH, 1994), p. 43. Hereafter cited as IT.

Rarest Archiver

expressions that have different meanings in diverse philosophers without clarifying of what he means by using them.

1.4. BUBER'S LIFE, HIS PHILOSOPHICAL WRITINGS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE FOR TODAY'S WORLD:

The life and works of Buber have tremendously influenced many great writers of various fields and have attracted a great deal of attention all over the world. He became one of the most creative voices in contemporary religious and philosophical thought; and as a prophet he called men to moral responsibility and mature life. Hence his life is put in par with Albert Schweitzer and Mahatma Gandhi of India who really formed the conscience of present times. According to Leon Chestov, Buber is one of those rare thinkers like Nietzsche and Soren Kierkegaard.[24]

The works of Buber and particularly his philosophy of I-Thou as a new and essential view of man's existence have exerted profound influence on various fields such as, philosophy, philosophical anthropology, religious philosophy, sociology, psychology, education, political science and ethics etc. He also wrote on the diverse fields of theology, sociology, psychology, Judaism, Hasidism, existentialism and education. He believes that there are the I-Thou relational elements in these fields of learning.

There have been generations of authors and scholars such as, Reinhold Niebuhr, Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, Paul Tillick, Martin D'Arey, Nicolai Berdyaev and Jacques Maritain who were profoundly influenced by Buber's philosophy of I-Thou relationship. Men of great achievements in every walk of life, great philosophers and theologians have shown in their writings that Buber's unique personality and thought pattern has

---

[24]. Leon Chestov, Martin Buber, (1953), pp. 705-706.

Rarest Archiver

basically influenced them. Maurice Friedman has given a long list of great scholars and eminent men who have been influenced by Buber.[25]

According to Reinhold Niebuhr, Buber is the greatest Jewish philosopher of the present times and in his opinion Buber's work of I-Thou is a great event in the religious life of the western world. Further he maintains that Buber has been the prophet of the soul and a witness to that truth of I-Thou relationship to him and to his companions even more than Kierkegaard in the modern world. [26]

Although Ebner and others had independently discovered the I-Thou concept, it was Buber who gave it its classical form and clearly shown the clarification and differences that exist between the I and Thou and the I-IT relationships. According to Karl Heim's strong opinion, the distinction between the I-Thou and I-IT of Buber is one of the greatest discoveries of the present times.

1.5. THE RELIGIOUS INFLUENCES ON MARTIN BUBER

In his first phase of life, Buber was attracted by a kind of mysticism, which taught to absorb the finite self into the infinite. Though Buber thought about this kind of mysticism as an escape from the reality of life because it regarded everyday life as an obscuring of the true life of person, he considered that it was very necessary for him to pass through this type of mystical phase in order to reach his own distinctive position. He accepts the fact that man has to frankly accept that personal form of being for which he is destined, a being that lives in person to person relation and which stands over

---

[25]. Maurice Friedman, Martin Buber, pp.162-164

[26]. Reinhold Niebuhr, He made the Universal Transparent, in Christian Century, (1965), p. 796.

Rarest Archiver

against him. Buber says, " Being true to the being in which and before which I am placed is the one thing that is needful".[27]

Buber had a long association with the Zionist movement mainly with its cultural side though at times many questions and doubts perplexed him. At a time when Buber had underwent confusion of his soul and its longing towards the personal direction to be rooted in the Jewish tradition, Theodor Herzl's Zionist movement delivered him from this type of narcissism. The aim and concern of this movement was to establish the political and religious development of an independent Jewish state as a new Israel. Buber's conversion to Zionism did not mean to him complete affirmation of everything Jewish or a complete reversal of his readiness for Jewish renaissance, but meant precisely to purify and cut away those elements in Judaism that he considered unhealthy degenerations or shallow adaptations of the hair splitting commentaries on the rules and ritual laws.[28]

In embracing Zionism, Buber concentrated and channelized all energies and gave himself to fruitful and unremitting work called the 'Jewish Renaissance. Few of Buber's specifically Zionist poems give us an insight into his inner devotion to this particular movement and one of those such poems is presented here from Buber's poem called, 'Prayer' written in 1899.

Lord, Lord Shake my people,
Strike it, bless it, furiously, gently,
Make it burn, make it free,
Heal your child

---

[27] John Macquarrie, 20th Century Religious Thought, (SCM Press Ltd, 26-30 Tottenham Road London N1, 1988), pp.195-96; Cf. also, Martin Buber, Pointing the Way, pp.ix-x.

[28] Maurice Friedman, Op. Cit., pp. 35-39.

Rarest Archiver

God, give the lost glow,
Back to my weary people,
In wild, intoxicated flames
Bestow on them your happiness.

See, only a fever can save it
And raging exuberance,
Awaken it, and, father, lead the throng
To Jordan' fields.[29]

Buber contributed a lot to early Zionism the Jewish Renaissance movement and later in 1918 he recognized that his early essays on such Jewish Renaissance showed no inkling i.e., by becoming a part of Jewish nation does not by itself transform a Jew. Though the Zionism gives a Jew roots into it but to be sure a Jew can be just as poor in soul with Zionism as without is. Here it does not mean that Buber's early nationalistic fervor was entirely invalid but it was an essential and important stage, which led him to future change or transformation.[30]

In his 'Roads to Hasidism', Buber tells that from 1904-1909, he retreated from his active life and publishing of Zionism. Later for almost for five full years he devoted himself to the study of Hasidic texts and traditions. Baal Shem Tov, the founder of Hasidism inspired and impelled Buber to dedicate himself for the love and study of Hasidim. Writing about Baal Shem Tov'e small work called Zavaat Ribesh, Buber writes, "The words flashed towards me. He takes unto himself the quality of fervor. He arises from sleep with fervor, for he is hallowed and become another man and is worthy to create and

---

[29]. Ibid, p.42.
[30]. Ibid., p. 76.

Rarest Archiver

is become like the Holy One, blessed be He when He created the world".[31]

Without doubt, Hasidism was the singly greatest influence in the life and writings and formation of Buber's fundamentally personalist and existentialist postures even from his childhood summer months in the little villages of Sadagora Czortkov. Hasidism, as a popular revivalist and mystical movement of the common people of the small rural communities of Europe rebelled against the artificial, legalistic and formalistic rabbinical interpretations of Talmud (law). The Rabbis were obsessed and preoccupied with the minute details, which were merely concerned with the letter of the law than with the spirit of it. Hasidism strongly opposed to the meticulous and scrupulous obedience to the 613 laws of Taruag Mitzvoth that were considered to the empty and hollow formalisms; and it propagated that man could never hope to find God and live in a genuine existence through these empty and meaningless rabbinical rituals.[32]

The Hasidism or in other words 'the pious one's' or 'those loyal to the Covenant', preached in the words of St. Bonaventure of thirteenth century, that this world is not something basically evil from which man must flee in order to lead a good life and save his life. We can read the glory of God on the pages of this book, which is the world. The world presents to us the shining examples of God's boundless goodness and beneficence. The nature proclaims the goodness of God and His generosity to man. There are the vestigea or the imprints of God in this world. Further, Hasidism emphasized charity, kindness, performance of good works, generosity to one's

---

[31]. Francis J. Lescoe, Op. Cit., p.136.
[32]. Ibid., p.140.

Rarest Archiver

neighbor and fervour with joy in the service of God and to one's fellow man.

Paul Pfuetze descried the life of the Hasidic communities that had profound influence on Buber's whole life and philosophy in the following words, "Devotion to God and personal union with Him, the cultivation of mystical personal religion; belief in the presence of the holy spirit; the binding of Order with the liberty; invidividualism with community; a strong spirit of brotherhood; a joyous spiritual fervour which found expression in singing and loving deeds were the common elements of piety in both the Hasidic and Brethren communities".[33]

Aubrey Hodes in his recent work, 'Martin Buber: An Intimate Portrait' developed two key concepts that Buber held to be most characteristic of Hasidism and which influenced him to a great extent. He writes, "There is divine spark in every human being, the Hasidism taught. But these sparks are isolated by shell, which enclose each person as armour would. Only by living an authentic life and hallowing the world can a man cast off these shells and break their embrace. It is done through 'Kavannah' (dedication of the heart) with the concentration of one's will focused toward the fervour, enthusiasm, responding with all one's heart and soul. It is a total commitment".[34]

Rabbi ben Eliezer (1700-1760) known as Baal-Shem-Tov (master of the good name) was a rare charismatic leader with his words about fervour that won the young man Buber's soul forever. He called people to build up a relationship through emotional commitment to comprehend God; and preached that it is through sincere recitation of prayer and desire of communion one can establish contact and rapport with the divine.

---

[33]. Ibid., p.141.
[34]. Ibid., p.142.

Rarest Archiver

The spiritual leader and a saint mystic was the Zaddik or the holy one or the righteous one who was charged with the guidance and direction of the souls entrusted to his care. He made a lasting impression on Buber's future life and philosophy. The relationship that existed between Zaddik and Hassidic community was praiseworthy about which Buber explains in the following graphic form, "The Zaddik helps everyone, but he does not relieve anyone of what he must do for himself…. The teacher helps his disciples find themselves in hours of desolation and the disciples in turn help their teacher find himself again. The teacher kindles the souls of his disciples and they surround him and light his life with the flame he has kindled."[35]

1.6. THE INFLUENCES OF PHILOSOPHIES ON BUBER

From his early days of university life, Buber was more influenced by the giants of German Idealism, Romanticism, and the German mystics like Meister Eckhart and Jacob Boehme.[36]

Many modern and nineteenth century philosophers such as, Feuerbach, Kierkegaard, Dostojevsky, Nietzsche and others meant most to Buber. He acknowledges Feuerbach's profound influence when he says that the latter gave him a decisive and important impulse.[37] Besides Hasidism, the nineteenth century Danish religious and existential philosopher Soren Kierkegaard was the strongest influence on Buber during this period. The religious outlook of Kierkegaard exerted powerful influence on Buber's existential understanding of truth. Dostojevsky influenced Buber with his spiritual intensity, fervour, depth of insight and the understanding of man's inner depths. Buber also found

---

35. Ibid., pp. 144-45.
36. Martin Buber, BMM, p.223.
37. Ibid., p. 182.

Rarest Archiver

in Dostojevsky, Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, the dynamism and concern for realization in life.

Nietzsche's influence was very much important on the life and philosophy of Buber and so he praises Nietzsche as the first path finder of a new culture and the awakener and creator of new vital values in the new world feeling. Though for Buber Feuerbach had out stepped the anthropological questions and had treated man basically and unproblematically, yet Nietzsche according to him, deepened and broadened those questions and gave them an important passion and force.[38] Though Buber is not much indebted to Nietzsche for his thoughts, yet he acknowledges his contribution to the human problem and the strengthening of anthropology.

1.7.THE INFLUENCES OF DILTHEY AND SIMMEL ON BUBER

From 1833-1911, Buber was the student of Wilhelm Dilthey and George Simmel in Berlin. As Buber himself understands, it was Dilthey who gave an impetus towards a philosophical anthropology to answer Kant's question, 'What is Man'?[39] It was Dilthey's doctrine of individuality and concreteness together with Feuerbach and Kierkegaard that influenced on Buber's thought on the relational 'Between'.

The influence of Simmel on Buber was much greater than that of Dilthey. The formula that Simmel held was, 'life is more than life and life transcends life'. Buber followed the line of philosophy of Simmel who held that life should be understood as self-transcendence, which attains a religious impetus. Buber is much indebted to Simmel's philosophy especially of man, the rejection of abstract concepts, the singularity of individuality, the concept of reciprocal action (man with man), togetherness which is the regulative world

---

38. Ibid., pp. 182-84.
39. Ibid, p.149.

Rarest Archiver

principle between an I and Thou etc. The concept of socialization of Simmel influenced Buber to a great extent. Simmel transformed the concept of reciprocal action to God-man relationship and so Buber's doctrine, "For he who speaks the word God and really has Thou in mind (whatever the illusion by which he is held), addresses the true Thou of his life, which cannot be limited by another Thou, and to which he stands in a relation that gathers up and includes all others",[40] is reflected in the thoughts of Simmel. Gustav Landauer, Buber's close friend, through his social thought and mysticism exerted a major influence on Buber's intellectual development; and introduced him to socialist theory which was religiously based and motivated and which stressed the need of genuine community life among people.

The teachings of the east too substantially influenced Buber's thoughts of unity and integrity of man. Taoism with its doctrine of man's self-realization, of unity, integrity and perfection and reality of truthful life, which is primal, influenced Buber to a great extent. Buddha too made a profound influence on Buber with his ideal of human realization and interiorness. Buber held Buddha in high esteem and held that Buddha is the example of an united and integrated soul.

In conclusion we can also maintain that Buber as a thinker of his time had closely followed the philosophical and religious thought of his contemporary philosophers like, Scheler, Heidegger, Jung, Satre, Bergson and other philosophers of diverse schools of thought. Though Buber was much influenced by many philosophers and their thought, yet essentially all his philosophical thoughts have been his own. His philosophy is an outcome of the existential life he lived.

Martin Buber, IT, p.100.

Rarest Archiver

CHAPTER- 2.

THE OUTLINE OF MARTIN BUBER'S PHILOSOPHY

2.0. Introduction

Before we look into an outline of Buber's philosophy, it is right here to glance into the meaning and definition of the term 'Existentialism'. One of the most difficult and elusive concepts to define is the term 'Existentialism' and what surrounds it, is a certain amount of confusion, precision and ambiguity. This type of difficulty exists due to the fact that the term 'Existentialism' is applicable to the diverse postures of many widely disparate philosophers, whose thought pattern ranges the full sequence from Kierkegaard's tremendous theistic commitment to Christianity and all the way to Jean Paul Satre's categorical denial of the existence of God and of spiritual realities. Thus, as a result, the same term is used to describe both theistic and atheistic nuances that are absolutely contradictory and diametrically opposed to each other.

There are historically two completely different philosophical stances that have been designated as 'Existentialism'. The medieval thinker St. Thomas Aquinas of the 13th century was the one who authored and held of the first type of existentialism. He insisted invariably on the primacy of the 'esse' or the act of 'to be' and made 'existence' as the pivotal point of his entire metaphysical philosophy. The modern Thomists such as, Jacques Maritain, Anton Pegis, Etienne Gilson and Frederick Copleston also have repeatedly pointed to what they call the only authentic existentialism that is rooted in the act of 'to be' or 'existence'.

The second type of existentialism is called as the 'contemporary existentialism and chronologically it is the concept of 19th and 20th centuries and Soren Kierkegaard and

Rarest Archiver

melancholy Dane were said to be its founders; and its exponents are German, French, Jewish, Russian and Spanish thinkers.

Though few historians of philosophy describe Blaise Pascal of 17th century as the first authentic existentialist and the great 4th century Christian thinker St. Augustinne of Hippo as the founder of the existentialist movement, the general agreement however is that the contemporary existentialism first received full articulation and fundamental postures only in the 19th century Soren Kierkegaard's writings. The names that are associated with the existentialist movement are, Soren Kierkegaard, Friedrich Nietzsche, Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, Gabriel Marcel, Martin Buber, Nikolai Berdyav, Jean Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Jose Ortegay Gasset, Miguel Unamuno, Albert Camus, Karl Jaspers, Maurice Merleau and Ponty etc.

The logical division of the existentialists can be put into two categories, such as, 1.Those that are theists and 2.Those that are atheists. The theistic existentialists are Soren Kierkegaard, Gabriel Marcel and Martin Buber; and the atheistic existentialists are Jean Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir and Albert Camus. Martin Heidegger has to be placed in a class of his own.[1]

2.1.THE DEFINITIONS AND THEMES OF EXISTENTIALISM

The definitions always deal with abstractions and universal where as the existentialism avoids the universal and the abstract. According to its nature, the existentialism cannot be classified as a system of philosophy and so logically speaking no definition of existentialism is possible.[2]

Though an accurate definition of existentialism is not possible, yet two types of definitions inclusive of theistic

---

[1]. Francis J. Lescoe, Existentialism With or Without God,p.7.
[2]. Ibid., p. 8.

Rarest Archiver

and atheistic stances could be maintained here. The first type of definition of existentialism can be given in this way, 'Existentialism cannot be said as a philosophy, it is a mood embracing a number of disparate philosophies. This type of existentialism favours dynamism, concreteness, personal involvement, engagement, action, choice and commitment; and the actual situation of the existentialism is the existential subject as the starting point of thought. The second type of existentialism can be defined this way, that ' the existentialism is chiefly the 20th century philosophy which is centered on analysis of existence, that stresses the freedom and responsibility of the individual, the irreducible uniqueness of an ethical or religious situation and subjective experiences of the individual being.[3]

We prefer to present here a brief account of the themes of existentialism as the clear-cut and concise definition of the same. Francis J. Lescoe gives few important common themes that are common to the existentialist thinkers, and the common themes that come under this system are:1. The existence and the individual, 2. Authentic and inauthentic existence, 3. Community, I-Thou, Co-esse, 4.Estrangement, alienation and absurdity,5.Dehumanization, objectification, depersonalization, 6.Phenomenology and existentialism.[4]

2.2. THE EXISTENCE AND THE OTHER

Existentialism cannot be called as the body of doctrines but a way of doing philosophy which begins by interrogating existence whereby the existence is said to be a kind of being that belongs to man in his concrete living, acting and deciding. Man's being is always fragmentary and incomplete so

---

[3]. Ibid., p. 10.
[4]. Ibid., p. 11.

Rarest Archiver

that he cannot have fixed essence or in other words man's essence is to exist and to exist with others.[5] Existence is being-in -the- world. The human environment is not just a world or world of things but there is also a personal environment. The existent lives in constant interaction with other existents or in other words, existence is being with others or being with one another. John Macquarrie maintains that the existence is essentially the 'Other' or 'Communion' in character and I cannot exist without the Other.[6]

2.3. THE INDIVIDUALISM, COLLECTIVISM & COMMUNITY

In his essay, 'What is man?', Buber criticizes 'Individualism' and 'Collectivism', the two errors of our times. Human life erroneously supposes that it has to choose between individualism and collectivism and in the same manner the thought too erroneously supposes that it has to choose between collectivist sociology and individualistic anthropology.[7] The individualism tries to understand only a part of man and sees him only in relation to himself; whereas the collectivism understands him only as a part. In other words, collectivism does not see man at all but it sees only 'society'. Neither individualism nor collectivism advance to understand man as a whole or the wholeness of man.

In Buber's close observation, however antithetical individualism and collectivism seem to be, in actuality, they are the same condition in different expressions. He strongly maintains that the union of social and cosmic homelessness of man characterizes the condition of individualism and collectivism. Man experiences in his existential constitution,

---

5. John Macquarrie, 20Th Century Religious Thought, (SCM Press Ltd,1988), pp. 351-53.
6. John Macquarrie, Existentialism, (Penguin Books, World Publishing Co., New York,1986),p.102.
Francis J. Lescoe, Op.Cit., p.151.

Rarest Archiver

the dread of life and dread of the universe and he is pushed into the corner of solitariness in these present times. As he is isolated in the midst of the tumultuous human world, he feels himself as an unwanted child, which is exposed to open nature. In order to save himself from the despair by which his solitary state threatens him, man resorts to glorify individualism, while remaining ever a solitary being.

Buber comments and asserts very vehemently that in a collectivity man is not a man. Though collectivity promises man security and to take care of his every need, it prevents him from being a man; and it does not allow him to commune with other human beings. The solitariness that man tries to escape from the individualism becomes magnified in a collectivity, and man slowly learns that the security that the collectivity offers to him is largely an illusion; and ultimately while claiming the wholeness of man, the collectivity only succeeds and achieves in reducing, desecrating and devaluating man's every bond with other human beings. The natural instinct and desire in every human being for contact and communion with other living beings is deadened and completely eroded in a collectivity. Instead of overcoming man's solitariness and isolation, a collectivity furthers, numbs and overwhelms the same. A collectivity does not bind the individuals but bundles them together as bundle of firewood. The human beings are armed, packed and equipped in common in a collectivity.

Buber exposes the third genuine alternative i.e., the 'Community' in which man's true nature can be realized. The 'Community' belongs to the very essential or the prime constitution of man as an existent. Only when man knows the other person in all his otherness as person, he breaks his solitariness and enters into a transforming meeting of

Rarest Archiver

communion with the other. This is true both sexually and linguistically.

Moving towards one goal, the multitude of persons exist in a growing community not side by side but with one another and they experience a turning, a dynamic facing of the other that flows into the I-Thou relationship. Community is where communion of persons happens and one's life lived towards one another is confirmed. There is a tremendous zeal for modern collectivity that in reality is a flight from the true consecrative community of persons or in other words, the vital relationalistic selves of person who are the heart of the world are in stake in our times. Only in the unity of human beings, which is community, a person can become aware of his self and actualize his selfhood. In a true community, the 'I' and 'You's' are bound together through a common concern in a cluster of interpersonal relations; and there are in it no more individuals as 'I' or ' You'. but living 'We'.

The common goal of a true community is God the 'Eternal Thou', because the people first of all live in mutual relationship with the living center (Eternal Thou) and then only they are able to live in mutual relationship with each other. Only when a group of people are united and related to a common goal, i.e., the Eternal Thou (God), a true community can be set up.

Commenting on Buber's concept of new community, Ernst Breisach maintains that the new community grows because of the free decision of authentic persons; and the new community should be set up without destroying man's personal independence which he gained by struggles throughout the centuries. The true community has to be built on the mutual acceptance and recognition of the dignity of individual persons and in turn it

Rarest Archiver

also demands free persons to work together in their voluntary cooperation with each other.

The 'Between' is another important concept of Buber's philosophy. According to Buber, a genuine community is impossible without the sphere of the 'between'; and the 'between' is not a fiction or fantasy. 'Between' as a reality is not something permanent or changeless but it needs a constant working anew and ever recreated whenever two persons meet. In a true interpersonal relationship of two persons, one turns to the other; and in order to relate with each other, each must reach out to a sphere far beyond his own which is called the sphere of the 'between'. The essential reality of human existence is person with another person. Something takes place between two persons which is said to be the special characteristic of human world only; and there is some reality which is rooted in one being to turn to another being as another and particular other being in order to relate with him in sphere that is common to both but further it reaches out beyond the special sphere of each being in relationship. The sphere of the 'Between' is established when man comes to exist as man but conceptually still it cannot be comprehended fully. The concept of the 'between' is to be acquired in the actual fact of between two persons and not through localizing the relation between two persons. 'Between' is the real place and bearer of what happens between two human beings and it is not an auxiliary construction by someone.

According to Maurice Friedman, the concept of 'between' is an essential and basic remainder which is common to two individuals when they 'happen' to each other and it is common to them which also reaches out far beyond the special sphere of each individual.

Rarest Archiver

Buber gives a number of examples of 'the between' that takes place between two individuals who genuinely transcend their own personal spheres. An absolutely spontaneous and genuine conversation in which each person speaks directly to the other and thereby elicits his unpredictable reply, a real lesson by a teacher which develops in mutual surprise, a real embrace, a real duel, the glances of two strangers that suddenly meet for few seconds in an astonishing and unrelated pure mutuality etc. are some of the important examples for the concept of 'the between'.

In Buber's clear understanding, the relation between God (Eternal Thou) and man is like an unsentimental and unreserved exchange of glances that take place between two individuals in an alien place. In one of his lyrics Buber maintains that on the subjective, on the side of the objective and on the narrow ridge where the I and Thou meet in the realm or sphere of the 'between'. In Will Herberg's understanding Buber's concept of the 'between' is the locus where the fullness of being is to be found.

Buber's basic ontological understanding is that the being of the human being is rooted in the 'between' and the fullness of the being of human being is in the 'between'; and the true being of the human beings can be grasped only in the 'between' of the I-Thou where such relationship is possible.[8]

2.4. THE INTERPERSONAL RELATION AND RELATIONSHIP

'Relationship' is a key concept in the vocabulary of Buber and he does not use it in an epistemological sense but as distinct from 'relation'. So, it is necessary here to make a clear distinction between 'relationship' and 'relation'. Generally, by 'relation' it is understood as one's attitudes

---

Ibid., pp.152-56.

Rarest Archiver

are friendly, cruel or kind to others or others like or dislike him.

In the term 'relationship', something more is structured and 'reciprocity' is also expected. Two persons enter into relationship and some aspect of reciprocity and openness exist between them. Thus this type of conceptual distinction is very necessary to understand Buber's philosophy of 'relationship' and 'relation'. Thus Buber uses 'Ich -Du Beziehung' to mean the I-Thou relationship and 'Ich-Es-Verhaeltnis' to mean I-IT relation. Although 'relationship' and 'relation' are used indiscriminately and their characteristic meaning of phrases are undetermined, yet their distinctive meaning becomes clear in relation to the primary attitudes of I-Thou and I-IT which is the heart of Buber's philosophy.

The 'existence' requires worldly and personal environment, and we meet persons in the worldly environment. The persons are co-existents and not as objects that belong to this world. We and other existents are in the world as centers of concern that shape the world.

2.5. THE TWOFOLD ATTITUDES OF MAN: 'I-THOU' & 'I-IT

According to Buber, the anthropological principles are the basis and proper to man, which constitute his existence as a special way and a special category of being.[9] The animals have environment and are conditioned by their surroundings and needs. But man alone has a world and though he is conditioned by the world, he is also able to condition his world and transcend all the necessities of life. There is a correlation between him and the world; and man is determined with this correlation and his existence is his attitude to the world,

---

[9]. Martin Buber, The Knowledge of Man, Trans. Maurice Friedman & Ronald Gregor Smith (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p.60. Hereafter cited as KM.

Rarest Archiver

which is called a fundamental posture, a way of setting oneself in his relation to the world. Thus, it is very essential here to understand the twofold attitude of man towards the world. In the first part of his central work, 'Ich und Du'- 'I and Thou' Buber gives a descriptive definition of man's two fundamental attitudes and their diverse forms of appearance in the world. He writes, "To man the world is twofold in accordance with his twofold attitudes".[10] Further Buber maintains that these fundamental postures or a way of setting oneself in one's relation to the world are the 'I-Thou and I-IT' attitudes.[11]

Buber often spoke about the twofold character of the world and the term 'world' was used in varying and interrelated connotations. The term 'world' is used in relation to man. Therefore man standing over against the world in a twofold attitude determines his correlation with it and consequently his existential being becomes twofold. Further the twofold character of his attitude is disclosed in a twofoldenss of language through the medium of speech. Thus the reality of man's existence that manifests itself in man-world relation is also twofold as far as man has the capacity for twofold speech; and through this twofold speech he meets his world in diverse ways.

Man's twofold character of attitude points to the twofold nature of his existence and his twofold attitude are represented by two primary words (Grundworte) which man speaks as I-Thou and I-IT. The utterances and meeting of these primary words involve reference to another to whom they are addressed because they are relational terms and not isolated words.

---

[10]. Martin Buber, I and Thou, Trans. Ronald Greg r Smith, (T&T Clark Ltd, Edinburgh, 1994), p.15. Hereafter cited as IT.

[11]. Ibid., p.15; Martin Buber, Eclipse of God, Trans. Maurice Friedman, et. al. (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1958), pp. 127-29. Hereafter cited as EG.

Rarest Archiver

Hence, according to Buber's teaching, the primary words are the combinations of I-Thou and I-IT; and the I-He or I-She can replace the I-IT. Hence, when man speaks the primary word of I-Thou or I-IT, the world exists to him as an I-Thou or an I-IT.[12]

Buber calls the philosophy of the twofold nature of human attitude as 'realizing' and 'orienting' attitudes in his work 'Daniel'. The I-Thou attitude is a personal attitude of presence, an attitude of realization, attitude of relationship and reciprocity, where as, the I-IT is an objective, presence less, of orientation and objectifying attitude. The I-IT also involves the monological attitude of objectifying and detachment. Buber's own words are, "AS EXPERIENCE, the world belongs to the primary word I-IT. The primary word I-Thou establishes the world of relation".[13]

In his work, 'Philosophical Interrogations', Buber writes that in the present times the I-IT is more frequent and more powerful than the I-Thou. Further he maintains that the I-Thou and I-IT are inextricably interwoven with each other and the human life in no moment is purely and solely of I-Thou or I-IT alone. 'Between' is the concept that Buber uses to determine about these attitudes that are present at any given moment or in what manner man relates to any object.

The two postures of I-Thou or I-IT clarify that the essence of man arises from these twofold relation to the existence; and they show the double structure of human existence itself. Hence, these are the two basic modes of our human existence with our being and they are the two basic models of our existence in general.[14]

2.5.1. THE I AND THOU

---

[12]. Ibid., p.15.
[13]. Ibid., p.18
[14]. Francis J. Lescoe, Op.cit., p. 158.

Rarest Archiver

The 'Ich und Du'- I and Thou' appeared as a small volume by Martin Buber in 1923 which was said to be one of the epoch making Books of our times. In his 'Real Life is meeting', Joseph Oldham maintained that the message of 'I and Thou' that is published in the present century, if it were understood and accepted, there would have been better consequences for the life of humanity in our times.

Gabriel Marcel initially expressed the use of the second person singular as 'Du' and in French 'Tu' which denoted a loving familiarity, an unreserved intimacy and a togetherness, which the English language cannot convey the pronoun 'You', because in English the same pronoun 'You' can be translated as impersonal and formal forms or highly personal and intimate forms.

Ronald Gregor Smith, the English translator of 'Ich und Du' tries his best to convey the special meaning of the 'Du' by using the archaic English pronoun 'Thou'. He used this word which seems to be an uncommon in usage and reserved for prayer etc. Though Walter Kaufman in his new translation of Buber's 'Ich und Du' rejected Ronald Gregor Smith's use of 'Thou' and insisted that 'You' is more desirable English translation of the German 'Du', yet, Ronald Gregor Smith wants to be more faithful to the inner thought of Buber in whose whole thought there is no suggestion to coming back to a metaphysic that sees a double order of being namely, the immanent and the transcendent, in which the transcendent (supernatural) is understood to be imposed upon the natural or the immanent order.

The chief insight of Buber in his 'I-Thou' is that there are two fundamental attitudes or postures in human experience; and they can be called as personal and functional or the 'I-Thou' and 'I-IT' relationships. The 'I' in these two attitudes

Rarest Archiver

is not the same because the primary 'I-Thou' can only be spoken with one's whole being and the 'I-IT' cannot be spoken with the whole being. The basic differences between these attitudes is not determined by the object with which the 'I' relates but by the manner with which the 'I' relates himself to the other (person, God, beings and objects) in relation.[15]

The 'I-Thou' speaks of a relation between subject and subject, a relation of mutuality and reciprocity and it establishes a genuine relationship between the one who addresses and the addressed. The 'Thou' is no longer a thing among other things in the universe but he fills the heavens. Buber's own words are, "no deception[16] penetrates here; here is the cradle of the real life".

The spheres in which the I-Thou relation arises are three: first our life with nature, second our life with human beings and the third our life with spiritual beings.[17] In the I-Thou relationship, the speaker has no thing for his object because where there is a thing there is another thing. 'Thou' has no bounds in I-Thou relation and the speaker takes his stand in relation to the other.[18]

The 'I' in the I-Thou relationship exercises a genuine existence by engaging itself in a truly interpersonal relationship with the other person. The I-Thou relationship is risky and open-minded because, if we try to hold back a part of our self, we may soon find ourselves in the I-IT situation. The I-Thou relationship is not rationally predictable and this can be called as the reminiscent of Kierkegaard's leap of faith.[19]

---

15. Ibid., pp. 156-58.
16. Martin Buber, IT, (1994), pp.21-22.
17. Ibid., pp.18-19.
18. Ibid., pp.17.
19. G.Vesey and P. Foulkes, Collins dictionary of Philosophy, (Collins London and Glasgow, 1990), p. 51.

Rarest Archiver

Hence, without any security and defense, we go to meet the 'Thou' in which we are totally involved. As the 'Thou' cannot be viewed in any casual and deterministic framework, he is to be encountered in the full freedom of his otherness, which is addressed and responds in his total unpredictable freedom.[20] In the I-Thou relationship there is a genuine listening, which does not know ahead of time what it will hear.

Will Herberg also maintains that the primary world of I-Thou points to a person-to-person or subject-to-subject relationship that involves reciprocity. According to Maurice Friedman, the I-Thou is the work of relationship and what characterizes it is, mutuality, presentness, directness, ineffability and intensity. The 'Thou' of the 'I-Thou' is not only limited to human beings but it also includes animals, trees, objects of nature and God (Eternal Thou). Will Herberg suggests a term called 'Transjective mode' which according to him is more accurate to describe the I-Thou relationship. Transjective mode specifies to what the person has relation with, which is there across him and the one with whom as person he establishes a relation. While the 'objective mode' may indicate to that which is outside of person, the 'subjective mode' points to that which is inside the person. Buber calls the I-Thou as the 'relationalistic life', which Herberg clarifies by explaining that the transjective mode is precisely the mode in which the I-Thou relationship and all truly existential thinking takes place; and the transjective mode concept can break the vicious circle of subject-object dichotomy.

Buber strongly believes that the only way in which a person can exercise a genuine existence is through engaging

---

[20]. Michael Wyschogrod, Encyclopedia or Philosophy, Vol. 1&2, p.410.

Rarest Archiver

himself in a truly interpersonal relationship with the other. The 'I' and 'Thou' (other) affect to a greater extent in I-Thou relationship; and life is 'between' persons and not in them. There can never be an I in itself or in isolation but it always faces a Thou in a truly personal relationship. It is through the 'Thou', man becomes 'I'. Professor Paul Pfuetze also states that the one who stands in loneliness and isolation, he is doomed to Lose life. Thus what Buber expresses is not merely a pretty moral sentiment but a law of human nature and existence namely: we cannot become selves as selves except in and through I-Thou relationship. In the I-Thou relationship other person, living beings or a work of art can speak to us and thereby we enter into relationship with them.[21] The I-Thou genuine relationship between persons consists a genuine direct conversation, which is absolutely spontaneous and elicits the other's unpredictable reply; it is a real lesson that develops mutual surprise, a real embrace and a real duel.[22]

The 'I-Thou' relation can be summarized into six of its qualities or characteristics. They are: 1.In the I-Thou relationship, one's wholeness of being is involved and one is conscious of meeting the whole of the other. 2. 'Thou' conceived as 'whole' involves an exclusiveness and a sacrificing of all the other possibilities to the demand of this particular relationship. 3. The I-Thou relationship is direct and mediation of sense, idea is possible here. 4. The 'I-Thou' deals with present and the 'Thou' becomes present. 5. The 'I-Thou' is agape in Biblical sense and not Eros or subjective feeling. 6. The 'I-Thou' involves genuine response,

---

[21]. Francis J. Lescoe, Op. Cit., pp. 159-60.
[22]. Ibid., p.155.

Rarest Archiver

responsibility, mutual obligation, pledge, promise, loyal bonded self, covenant and fidelity.[23]

2.5.2. THE I AND IT

According to Buber, when we live continuously among objects and things, we begin to have an I-IT relationship with human beings also. While we take an objective attitude towards a human being and view him as a part of the world, or a thing, we establish with him an I-It relationship.[24] The 'I' is an observer and partially involved in the I-IT relationship. The relationship in the I-IT is indirect, non-reciprocal, already categorized and using the 'other' as an object. There can never be 'present' in the I-IT relationship, but it has only the 'past'. All the objective knowledge about a person is knowledge of his past or of what he has been rather what he is presently. This type of I-IT relationship, involves utilization and control and the object becomes wholly passive.

According to Buber's optimistic view, it is impossible for man to avoid the I-IT relationship completely because he must live in the world and it is necessary for him to use and control things and man sometimes as well. In the doctrine of Buber, this world and the primary word I-IT is not evil because matter is not evil. If the matter presumes to have the quality of present being, then it is evil; and it masters him overrunning and robbing him of the reality of his own 'I'.[25] Though man orders his world and builds his economies in and through I-IT relationship, yet one who lives constantly in this type of relationship only cannot be truly human person. Though one's ability to experience and use this world also should

---

[23]. Ibid., p.161.
[24]. Wyschogrod, Op.Cit., p.410.
[25]. Ibid., p.410.

Rarest Archiver

grow, and there is a progressive augmentation of the 'I-IT' world, yet the human beings must rise above it.

Both Buber and Gabriel Marcel agree that the twentieth century, with its spectacular advances in modern sciences and technologies threaten to depersonalize and degrade man completely. Nikolai Berdyaev expresses such 'I-IT' situation as 'objectifying of man'. The human beings are turned into faceless units of a mass society and impersonal beings.[26] In the I-IT relationship human beings are considered only as objects to be used and discarded or to be thrown on the heap of scraps; and man is reduced into mere graph. In the I-IT world man loses his initiatives, creativity and spontaneity.

The 'IT' attitude can be taken up and interpreted by 'Thou' and through such ever-renewed act of entering into reciprocal relationship a person can authenticate his human existence.[27]

2.6. THE ETERNAL THOU

The notion of God is 'Eternal Thou' in Buber's philosophy. The Eternal Thou has the I-Thou situation in which man can sustain indefinitely; and the Eternal Thou can be recognized in all things as the 'Wholly Other'. He is not only observed but reveals Himeself. We look out towards the fringe of Eternal Thou through each process of becoming and in each sphere in its own way. In each Thou we address the Eternal Thou and in each we become aware of the breath of the Eternal Thou.[28]

According to Buber's argument, Eternal Thou by his very nature cannot become 'IT' and who cannot be reduced to an object. Though others may become 'IT' yet, the Eternal Thou cannot become 'IT' because it is the present reality, the ever

---

[26]. Francis J. Lescoe, Op. Cit., p. 163.
[27]. Elizabeth Divine et. al , Thinkers of the 20th Century, p.98.
[28]. Martin Buber, IT, p. 19.

Rarest Archiver

renewed presentness of meeting. We find the Eternal Thou both within and without the world. Through exploring and detachment to the life of things we come to the unfathomable Eternal Thou; and the hallowing this present life we meet the living God the Eternal Thou.[29] Those who enter into the absolute relationship of everything like beings, things, earth and heaven, enter into the absolute relationship of Eternal Thou. The Eternal Thou is the proper ground of the world and through being in the world and not renouncing it we behold the Eternal Thou. God, as the Eternal Thou by His nature never ceases to be Thou for us and He embraces all relations. It is through I-Thou relationship to other fellowmen in the world, man can establish relationship with the Eternal Thou. The Eternal Thou is the God of I-Thou relationship.

In Buber's most optimistic understanding, though one may abhor the name of God and believe himself to be an atheist or godless can address God when he gives totally to addressing the other as 'Thou' with his whole being. The Eternal Thou is connected with the interhuman, social and center of all relations; and every 'Thou' is glimpse of Eternal Thou.[30]

Man, through his I-Thou relationship transcends his own personality, his own limits and touches upon the absoluteness by acquiring his dignity and value that is rooted in the infinite Eternal Thou. Though we encounter the Eternal Thou in our limited and partial relations with one another, He is the permanent basis to all our relationships; and without the Eternal Thou all these relationships are sterile and do not bear fruit.

The Eternal Thou(God) is a person in the sense that He enters into direct relation with humanbeings in creative,

---

[29]. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., p.355.
[30]. John Macquarrie, Op. Cit., p.197.

Rarest Archiver

revealing and redeeming acts and through which He makes possible for us to enter into a direct relation with Him.[31]

Buber calls the Eternal Thou (God) as the 'Absolute Person' who is limitless and we encounter the Absolute as Thou. God the Eternal Thou as portrayed in the Bible enters into direct relation with us and speaks personally with us. Human beings sometimes reduce the Eternal Thou (God) of the I-Thou relationship into I-IT relationship and to an object or to a utilitarian device of granting favours. Time and again man has forgotten to address the Eternal Thou in I-Thou relationship and given intellectual assent to Him as the philosophers do.[32] The Eternal Thou addresses and sets us free to experience the I-Thou relationship with Him and with others.[33]

In conclusion we can say that Buber brought out the more tragic side of human life in what he calls the exalted melancholy of human fate. According to him every 'IT' is potentially a 'Thou' and every 'Thou' has to sink back into an 'IT'. When we cease to address in an I-Thou relationship, even persons and the Eternal Thou (God) are transformed and reduced into mere Its or objects. The contemporary world is sickly because of the injury that is caused to the fundamental personal nature of man, between man and man, and between man and God the Eternal Thou. Thus, in the words of John Macquarrie, Buber becomes the prophet who proclaims that the hope of present times depends upon the immediate renewal of human relationship.[34]

---

[31] . Ibid., p.197.
[32] . Michael Wyschogrod, Op.Cit., p.410.
[33] . Francis J.Lescoe, Op.Cit., p.168.
[34]. John Macquarrie, Op.Cit., p.197.

Rarest Archiver

CHAPTER-3

THE 'I'

3.0. INTRODUCTION—THE QUESTION AND CONCEPT OF MAN

One of the last great masters of Hasidism, Rabbi Bunam Von Przysucha once addressed his pupils saying that he wanted to write a book called 'Adam' that would contain about the whole man but later he decided not to write about it.[1] These words of the master express the whole story of the human thought about man. From times past, man knew that he is the subject most important and deserving of his own study, but he has failed in treating this subject in accordance with its total character and concept. The French philosopher Malebranche maintained that the 'Knowledge of Man' deserved most of his study. But he believes that such knowledge that we possess is uncultivated and undeveloped; and generally men neglect and do not dedicate themselves to it. Malebranche too did not establish a doctrine of the being of man.

Kant put forth four questions in philosophy about the concept of man and they are: 'What can I know?', 'What ought I to do?', 'What may I hope?' and 'What is man?'. The philosophical anthropology answers the fourth question, while the metaphysics, ethics and religion answer the first, second and the third questions of Kant. Kant assigns the being of man to discipline of philosophical anthropology. It is remarkably clear that Kant's own anthropology of what he himself published or his copious lectures on man, absolutely failed to achieve what he demanded from philosophical anthropology. Though Kant offers an abundance of valuable observations for the knowledge

---

1. Martin Buber, Between Man and Man, Trans. Ronald Gregor Smith, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961), 148. Hereafter it is cited as BMM.

Rarest Archiver

of man such as, egoism, on dreams, on mental diseases etc, but the question 'What is man?' is simply not dealt or raised. The problems of man such as, his special place in cosmos, his connection with destiny and fellowman, his death, his attributes on ordinary and extraordinary encounters with the mystery etc, are not at all touched upon.[2]

Human being is the only being who searches for his meaningful existence and he makes himself as the center of his own existence.[3] Time and again man asks question as, 'In what does his human nature consist?'. According to Karl Jaspers' observation, though man tries to answer himself, he arrives only at inadequate descriptions about himself and at partial answers, because essentially he is more than he can know of himself. Haman observes that man is capable of any form in an infinite measure. In Nietzsche's understanding man is said to be some fleeting thing and plastic; and one can mould him as he likes or wills.[4] Scheler commented that we cannot possess an unified idea of man. Many scientific descriptions give only partial answers about man and forget his total nature. No philosopher has ever given a satisfactory answer about man.

Buber gives importance to the self-examination of human being in his philosophy. Though man is inclined to pose questions about the world, nature, cause of things and God, yet in and through these questions he is asking questions about himself like 'What are human beings? Or what is man??'.[5] In Buber's understanding, philosophical knowledge of man is fundamentally his own self-reflection; and the philosopher who pursues the field of anthropology should first of all reflect

---

[2]. Ibid., pp.148-50.
[3]. Ibid., pp.154-55.
[4]. Ibid., p.183.
[5]. R.S.V. Bible, Psalm. 8:4-5. p. 577.

Rarest Archiver

about himself as the rationalizing being.[6] The fundamental concern of philosophical anthropology should be about man in his wholeness.

Paul Pfuetze observed that there is a great struggle between democracy and totalitarianism, individualism and collectivism, capitalism and communism over man's nature, meaning, destiny and moral responsibility. As today's modern man has become a problem to himself, his nature has become an important question in this world. Therefore, in this situation of the question of man, Buber's concept of relationship and his existential anthropology has pertinent meaning and attention in this world. Buber believes that we can come closer to the question of 'what is man?' though we cannot gain or claim an exhaustive knowledge of man.[7] The philosophy of I-Thou can help us in Buber's understanding, a genuine contact with other beings. Hence, Buber's anthropological question essentially and vitally concerns about every man and his existence, dimension that was forgotten earlier.

3.1.THE QUESTION- 'WHAT IS MAN'?

One of the constant concerns of many great thinkers from the ages past was to deal about the question of man. Socrates declared in Plato's Phaedrus that he devoted himself to the study of his own self. Plato and Aristotle taught that the essence of man should be understood from his distinctive relations to things and other beings. Descartes in his 'Meditations' dealt with the question about his own existence. The philosophical anthropology today conceives man in his concrete existence. In Buber's understanding the present sociological and cosmological forms, though preserve the external structure of the older forms of human life and

---

6. Martin Buber, BMM,pp.154-55.
7. Ibid., p. 149.

Rarest Archiver

society, yet they have caused decay inwardly and have steadily lost their meaning and spiritual power of man. Thus, on account of all these, man is pushed into solitude and insecurity; and even in the busy activities, he feels lonely, estranged and socially insecure.[8] Man has created the critical situation for himself in his relation to his created things and is unable to master the world because of the three fields of modern technology, economical productions and political power of his own making. Because, all these factors have made man so powerless, he is now made to ask the fundamental question of his own existence.[9]

According to Buber, another cause for man, he being pushed into the corner is the philosophical development and the psychological factors. He holds that the philosophical anthropology as a tendency to react against traditional philosophy comes to the rescue of man to explain his existential nature. As the traditional rational philosophies emphasized more upon the rational character of man, the philosophical anthropology in Buber's understanding looks at man in his totality. Though Kant failed to answer the basic question 'What is man?', it was Buber who made a critical revolution in philosophy that forced man to pose the basic question 'What am I?'; and this legacy laid a strong foundation to the contemporary philosophical anthropology.

3.2. 'WHAT IS MAN?'- AN ANALYSIS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Buber discusses in his historical discussion, the philosophical question as the precondition, which, in the history of the West became an important question. In the 'History of the human Spirit, distinguishing the epochs of habitation, he mentions that now man lives in the world as in a

---

[8]. Ibid., pp. 192-93
[9]. Ibid., p.194.

Rarest Archiver

house where he feels himself a stranger in it. The Aristotelian philosophy had dealt the world picture of man as a thing among many things of the universe and man as an experiential object. According to the understanding of Raimund Paniker, Greeks taught that man was a part in the cosmos and a thing among many things in the universe.

St. Augustine came to the philosophical arena after seven hundred years of Aristotle's exit. He took up the question, 'What is man that Thou (God) art mindful of him?' of the psalmist of the Bible in another address and tone. He was astonished at the presence of man and turning towards God and the world, he taught that man couldn't be a part of the world and a thing among things.[10] The 'confessions' of St. Augustine is one of the best treaties ever written on man. St. Thomas Aquinas and Scholastics of the middle ages taught about the new cosmic house of man and his redemption, basing their faith in Christianity of Christ's redemption.[11]

The latter Scholastics held that man is a special kind among many species and has a spiritual soul that is substantially united with his body. Though the question of man arose at the end of the middle ages, it was Pascal who first tried to unite both the spirit of man and the infinite space of this universe; and he gave a concept of a home to man in this universe.[12] Spinoza succeeded Pascal who held that there is ordered security of peace and serenity in nature, and through the spirit unified with nature, man becomes happy. He maintained that it is through man, the love of God is manifested in the universe and this solution seems to satisfy

---

[10]. Ibid., pp.159-60.
[11]. Ibid., pp. 160-61.
[12]. Ibid., p.163.

Rarest Archiver

GDB-3333
181.4.84.1
VIJ
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
REFERENCE ONLY

the question of man's existence in the world.[13] In the history of 19th century, there were systematic attempts to give man a house in this vast universe of insecurity, which later culminated in individualism and collectivism categories of man's existence.

Hegel, through his dialectical principles of thesis, antithesis and synthesis tried to answer the anthropological question of man. But later, he ended up with the universal reason and not with the concrete human person and his community; and the modern man, the universe of Hegel can never become a real universe.

Karl Marx strongly held that the classless society of proletariat can be the only guarantee of classless society for man's existence and it is the real picture of human society. But his doctrine of classless society only remained in appearance and was unreal. It was Feuerbach who went far beyond Marx and thought man as the I-Thou, man with other man and man in the community of fellow beings. In his understanding, man has his complete development of being only in and through his community of human beings. The discovery of 'Thou' and 'I' by Feuerbach was said to be the 'Copernican Revolution' in the modern thought which pointed beyond the Cartesian contribution to the modern philosophy, and Buber's whole of I-THOU theory became possible because of it.

Nietzsche taught that man is the animal who is not yet established or determined like the other species; and he is becoming or he is in the development of becoming superman. Further, he held that man should not live for himself as an individual but in connection with nature. But in Buber's understanding Nietzsche's solution to man's existence is

---

13. Ibid., pp.166-67.
14. Ibid., pp. 241-42.

Rarest Archiver

ambiguous and without the foundation for the philosophical anthropology.[15] Kierkegaard rejected the Hegelian philosophy and German Idealism and through his category of 'Single One' taught that the individual had to be taken out from all his earthly relations and he has to in dread and anxiety stand alone before the Absolute (God). Kierkegaard's man has to become Single One in order to enter into the Single One's relation and for such relationship, he has to renounce the essential relation to another (other) as Kierkegaard himself did with his fiancé Regina.[16]

Kierkegaard's anthropology is theological anthropology, which speaks of God and as bounded to each other; and this mutual connection manifests the Absolute's entrance as person into the life of man. Buber accepts Kierkegaard's concept of man but he renounced the theological presumption of Kierkegaard in order to acquire its philosophical foundation. Heideggar, through the 'fundamental ontology' or the doctrine of existence (dasein-being there) or being there or to stand out there taught that man as the present being is the only one whom we know who, being the present being has relation to his own being.[17] The 'existence' or 'dasein' would mean essentially to be or being in the world or man's essence of being is to be in the world and bound up with the world in his existence.[18]

Buber believes that Heidegaar deals only with man as a limited part of man's living whole and he looks at him as a metaphysical reality. Thus, criticizing Heidegaar's stand, Buber maintains that man is real as far as his being is concerned and he is to be understood only in his connection

---

15. Ibid., pp. 170-91.
16. Ibid., p. 209.
17. Ibid., p.199.
18. John Macquarrie, An Existentialist Theology, pp.38-40.

Rarest Archiver

with other beings in relationship.[19] Buber, while rejecting Kierkegaard and Heidegaar's stand of man's relationship, maintains that man becomes whole not in virtue of being 'Single One' or in virtue of a relation to himself but only in virtue of a relation to another self. In Buber's critical understanding, the concepts of Heidegaar such as, dasein-existence or being present, Mitsein- man's being in the world and Fuersorge- Man's care or solicitude for the other beings do not mean an I-Thou relationship or essential relationship.[20] An existential thinker Binswanger agrees with Buber and holds that the I and Thou relationship should not be equated with Heidegaar's concept of 'being in the world or solicitude or anxiety etc.[21]

Rotensreich held that there is no division between the relation to other fellow being and one's own being. Further he maintains that the concept of the self-consciousness of the partners is the center of all human relations.[22] There are few striking similarities between the later writings of Heidegaar and Buber's earlier works which present man in his wholeness and as distinct being from animals in every form of life in his distance and relational awareness. The school of Husserl treated the problem of man as an independent philosophical problem.

Scheler clearly expresses the situation of man in our times and holds that though we have a scientific, philosophical and theological anthropology of man, yet we do not have clear and consistent idea of man. The increase in the number of

---

19. Martin Buber, BMM, p. 200.
20. Ibid., pp. 201-10.
21. John Macquarrie, Existentialist Theology, pp.85-86.
22. Paul Arthur Schilpp & Maurice Friedman, The Philosophy of Marin Buber, Library of Living Philosophers, vol. 12,(1967), pp. 127-29.

Rarest Archiver

particular sciences have confused and obscured the concept of man. It is through willing to make a complete tabula rasa of all traditions about the question of man and looking at his being in and through extreme methodical aloofness and astonishment, we can reach lasting insights. Scheler mainly concerns himself with the concreteness of man and what he has in common with other living beings and about the specific character of man that makes him to stand out from what is common to all other beings. Scheler also holds that the spirit (godhead) or the divine (Absolute) has the self-realization through man and this happens through the process of world history. Thus, it is in man, God becomes real and realizes Himself. It is through and within man the divine becomes real out of His primal ground; and in and through the living man the spirit divine busts out in flames and the same divine spirit is inserted in all the living beings too.

Scheler's ontology is the concept of historical time, which also exists among Hegel, Marx and Nietzsche's philosophies. The historical time is made absolute as the divine is fully brought down into historical time and made dependent on it; and God becomes in historical time. Beyond this historical time, the relationship of man does not exist.[24]

3.3. THE HUMAN PERSON AND THE INDIVIDAL

In Greek, the 'Person', etymologically means 'Proposon' which originally meant a mask worn by an actor in theatre; and later it changed its connotation to any individual's character in the stage of his life. In the modern Western and Indian languages the term 'Person' has various usages that seem to depend and border on each other. Though there was very little discussion among Greeks and Romans on the concept of person or

---

Ibid., pp. 224-26.

Rarest Archiver

personality, the Church fathers like Tertulian and Augustine, through their Christian theology of Trinity and incarnation, developed the concept of 'person', which meant a principle of existence on which the individual's perfection takes place. The concept of 'Person' developed very passively in Middle Ages and among the Scholastics, but it was Boethius who held that a person, as a particular type is an individual substance with a rational nature. St. Thomas Aquinas and other Scholastics emphasized the substantial aspect of the personality of the person and they maintained that a person with his special excellence and dignity has his independent existence having dominion over his own activities. Duns Scotus, Richard of St. Victor and others held that an individual's intellectual nature is a person.

Cajetan and other Thomists taught that the personality of a person should be based on a positive determination which is called the subsistence mode which functions to make the nature incommunicable and terminated in itself, and which is capable of receiving its own existence as an individual. Suarez thinks that the ultimate foundation of personality is the positive perfection and it consists in incommunicability in the sense it excludes all relationship to another. Thus personality is existence.

The eighteenth century philosophers like Leibniz and Locke characterized person in terms of self-consciousness and according to the latter, 'person' is a thinking and an intelligent being with reason and reflection. In his famous dictum, 'Cogito Ergo Sum', Descartes defines 'person' as an 'individual substance' or the self-conscious ego. His theory fails to speak of the relational concept of person, which is the basis for human existence.

Rarest Archiver

The relational philosophers like Rosenzweig, Ebner, Gabriel Marcel, Martin Buber and Guardini strongly maintained that the essence of man as person consists only in the relational structure of man. And man becomes a person through his responsible relationship with the other beings. In and through the concrete and diverse situations of lived life of I-Thou relationship, man becomes a person.

While the personalist philosophers like, E. Mounier, L. Lavelle and others gave more importance to spirit and stressed more on the communicative or operative aspect of person, it was Buber who taught that man's existence should depend on the communion with other persons in I-Thou relationship. His own words are. "THERE IS no I taken in itself, but only the I of the primary word I-Thou".[25]

To be in spiritual communion with other beings is the peculiarity of man, which Buber rediscovered in his system. While the I-IT relationship is the instrumental and functional in man's dealing with others, the I-Thou relationship is distinctively personal in one's dealing with other persons. In Buber's understanding the concept of person and personality consists in the mysterious imprint of 'I' that unifies all the experiences of person and it alone gives identity to him. The essential identity of person consists in the 'I' alone; and such a type of unity of experience as person can be established through man's meeting with other persons in his total awareness and relationship. In his I-Thou relationship man perceives his wholeness as a human person and realizes with perception of his dynamic center as 'I' of unique personality.[26]

---

25. Martin Buber, IT, (1994) , p.16.
26. Martin Buber, The Knowledge of Man, ed. With an Intro. Maurice Friedman, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965), p.80. Hereafter cited as KM.

Rarest Archiver

Man attains his reality of personality only in the present which takes place in actuality and potentiality though at times there can be change of alternation between the moments of presentness and its absence as regards his existence is concerned.

3.4.MORE CONCRETELY THE 'INDIVIDUAL AND 'PERSON'

We are born not as persons but gradually we become persons. Buber makes a fundamental distinction between individual and person in contrast to the theories of traditions. In his opinion, the I of man is twofold in accordance to his twofold attitudes. The I that corresponds to the I-IT relation means as 'its-own-being' or 'individualistic' individual. In German, the 'its-own-being' means 'Eigenwesen'. The I of the I-IT closes onto oneself and he is unable to share oneself with his Thou. This also refers to the Hasidic distinction between the ego of the egoistic individual and the deeper self of person.[27]

While the I of the I-IT means the individualistic individual, the I of the I-Thou mean 'Person'. In the I-IT, the I is conscious of himself alone, and he tries to experience, use and observe others as mere objects. Thus the individuality of a person refers only to his relation to himself and a specific being separated from other beings; he is only concerned with his own interest, utility and worries only of his genius, ability and race.[28]

The concept of 'person' consists in an open sharing and in transcending oneself with his whole being. 'Person' is one who participates and responds to reality in his openness. When the I says 'Thou', he has no object but stands in total

---

[27]. Martin Buber, Hasidism and Modern man, ed. Maurice Friedman,(New York: Horizon Press, 1958), pp.159-60.

[28]. Martin Buber, IT, pp. 62-64.

Rarest Archiver

relationship. Man becomes a person only when he enters into total relationship with his Thou. Man becomes real person only when he is aware of the personal presence and personal reality of the other in total reciprocal relationship. One becomes aware and conscious of himself as human being only by being with the other persons. Through such total reciprocal relationship, man becomes a participant of a new reality called the 'Between'.

In such a reciprocal and total relationship, the I of the person and other realize in totality. While a person asserts his existence in real I-Thou relationship, an individual in I-IT relationship affirms his existential manner. In Buber's understanding, the spiritual substance of a person matures in subjectivity of I-Thou relationship.

An 'individuality' is just a certain uniqueness of man that can also be developed and in Jung's understanding, this type of uniqueness of man is called an individuation. Man, by being differentiating himself from other individuals, becomes an individual, distinct and separated; and in such a case he is not a man. An individual to be a person has to participate in the reciprocal I-Thou existential relationship with other persons and thereby he comes in contact with the real world, which in turn comes in contact with him.[29]

A person is the real self in the human existence who participates in I-Thou relational structure with others; and through this, his personality is determined. The I requires a Thou to become I and becoming I, I says Thou to the other. The actual human life is encounter. In the unmediated wholeness of I-Thou relationship the I becomes a person and not an individual.

---

[29]. Martin Buber, KM, (1965),pp. 183-85.

Rarest Archiver

Buber also believes that no man is pure person or pure individual as no one can be free or unfree. As every man lives in his twofold I, becoming realized does not take place all of a sudden. Man can become more personal only when there exists the stronger I of the primary word of I-Thou.[30]

Two poles of 'individual' and 'person' pull every man; and those that are person oriented are called 'person' and those that are determined by individuality are called individuals; and the true history of humanity takes place between these two poles. Buber understands that the Cartesian Cogito Ergo- (I Think), or I is not a living body-soul person but just a subject of consciousness of the person. Descartes' 'person' is just a matter of doubt and not a corporeality. He abstracts the 'I' from the concrete situational experience and identifies him as 'Person' where by he failed to find the fundamental starting point for the knowledge of man. According to Buber, genuine interpersonal relations should experience the 'I' of a living person with other persons and not by deduction or doubt.[31]

Thus, in Buber's concrete clarification, the individual just associates and a person relates with others. While the individual merely touches the personage of other from outside, the person relates inwardly with the other as Thou. Though the individuality is a necessary substratum, and is only the beginning towards man's realization and existence, yet, human existence remains imperfect if it stops with it alone. The perfect human existence can be achieved only through the interpersonal relationships with the real persons. A man is a person in so far as he is confirmed and accepted by his Thou.[32]

---

[30]. Martin Buber, IT, (1994), p.22.

[31]. Martin Buber, Eclipse of God, Trans. Maurice Friedman, et.al. (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1958), pp. 39-41.

[32] Martin Buber, KM, (1965), pp.71-72.

Rarest Archiver

Man's unique dignity consists only in his capacity to enter into personal relationship with the other. Every man is invited to enter into personal relationship with the other and it is by the acceptance and confirming the other as partner in relationship, man's existence is brought to realization.

Buber opines that the true humanity is possible only through the affirmation of the other as person. A great relationship exists only between real persons.[33] The unity dominates in the relationship between man and man, and separation reigns in the world of individuals. In the world of persons, only a man who has become real self or person is able to enter into complete I-Thou relationship with another self or person based on the existential equality.[34]

The personal life emerges only in the encounter of person with the other person.[35] In order to enter into genuine reciprocal relationship, the I must become fully integrated and person oriented. Only through the discovery of his Thou, man becomes conscious of himself as 'I'. The primary fact of human existence is individual in relationship where two persons are in real reciprocal relationship. The unity of personal here is not the 'I' but the 'I' and 'Thou' relationship. The relationship is real and nothing else.[36] Hence, person appears as a real self only through his relationship with other persons.[37]

The concept of 'Person' has an ontological uniqueness in contrast to 'individual'. Person is autonomous, independent being who, as an ontological prospect calls for a radical

---

[33]. Ibid., pp.84-86.
[34]. Martin Buber, BMM,pp.212-13
[35]. Paul Tillich, Systematic Theology, (Chicago: University Press, 1951), Vol.III, pp. 40-42.
[36]. Macmurray, Persons in Relation, pp.61-62.
Martin Buber, EG, (1965), pp. [illegible].

Rarest Archiver

respect; and in Guardini's opinion, person is spiritually creative and self-determined in so far as he stands in himself. Person exists for himself and by himself and has a structural and operative autonomy; and others cannot make use of him.

In Kant's opinion, 'person' is of unconditional worth and dignity; and he is the basis of the possibility of individual morality and so the respect is due to person and not to things or objects. The person has moral character and not things. Thus person cannot be used merely as means to one's end. A person in his right is an end in himself and source of value and dignity. Maritain holds that even to God, a person is not merely an object or like a cog in the world's mechinary.[38]

When a person is treated impersonally, he becomes an IT or object and his personal and moral character is denied. With the denial of person's personal and moral character, his freedom as a moral agent and his own determining reality of his own destiny is destroyed.

But however, Macmurray maintains that for the existence of positive personal existence, the negative or impersonal attitude should also exist in the personal relations. Thus there is the paradox in the personal relationships. The negative, though it is secondary is most necessary for the sake of the positive attitude. Thus we can maintain that in the intentionally personal relation, there should be the impersonal relation as well.[39]

Though Anzenbacher criticizes Buber by maintaining that the latter's doctrine of person is radically irrational and inactualistic tendency that seems to dissolve the substantial continuity of person or the actual self-experience seems to be contradicted. But many maintain that Buber's terminology of

---

[38]. Maritain, The Person and the Common Good, pp. 24-25.
[39]. Macmurray, Op.Cit., pp.33-35.

Rarest Archiver

'Person' and 'individual' show very clearly the continuation of the psychological I. Buber's concept of person is unlike the Scholastic notion of individual substance of rationality; and the concept of person is to be understood ontically not ethically.

3.5. THE CONCEPT OF 'PERSON' THROUGH RELATIONSHIP

Buber presents a new theory about the knowledge of our selves, of others and of the external world through his philosophy of I-Thou. He contradicts the theory that is based on the subject-object dichotomy and affirms that a child does not first see an object and enter into some relationship with it but rather there is primarily a longing for the relationship in the child.[40]

Buber's fundamental view of the premise is that an I is not an I except through its meeting with a 'Thou' and our belief in the reality of the external world also comes only from our relationship with other selves and beings. The philosophers like Jakobi, Feuerbach, Ebner and Marcel too accepted the above concept of Buber to some extent.

The important condition for the possibility of a person is the 'Thou' in relationship; and man becomes 'I' only through his 'Thou'. Thus Buber's own words are, "In the beginning is relation—as category of being, readiness, grasping form, mould for the soul; it is the *a priori* of relation, the *inborn Thou*".[41]

Guardini too supported the concept of Buber by maintaining that the persons exist only in the form of relationship and relatedness to other persons. A person is destined by his very nature to become the 'I' of a Thou and he becomes meaningful only through his mutual relationship with other persons. The

---

[40]. Martin Buber, IT, (1994), pp. 40-44.
[41]. Ibid., p.43.

Rarest Archiver

ontological truth is that a fundamentally solitary person cannot exist. In Karl Jasper's terminology, the all-encompassing relationship is the characteristic of the person in relationship; and one discovers his true being only through his relationship with others. In the opinion of Prof. Lotz, in the relational ontology alone, all persons are bound to stand in their openness of being to each other whereby they find their true being in one another.

Human beings, besides being thinking beings, are the unities of their various experiences of their being; and only in the actual meeting with fellow beings as 'Thous' this unity of experiences can be established, whereby they become a living reality in the sphere of the 'between' of persons.

According to Buber, 'Between' is a basic category of personal existence. As Kant also understands, personality of a person is not a being among other beings but a category. A person is 'meeting'; and he becomes the center of being in the double movement of distancing and entering into relationship. Man, by his virtue of a relationship to another self becomes whole.[42]

There is the inner harmony of spirit and deed in the realized person who comes to be through the relationship with his fellowmen. The person in his wholeness can open himself to the other in the uniqueness of his being and accept him as his Thou; and such person alone is able to raise the various forms of his relationship to completion and fulfillment with nature, persons and Eternal Thou (God). The underlying reality of human existence is the relationship. The I-Thou relationship makes the concept of the wholeness of person possible. The personal wholeness is to be achieved though the I-Thou relationship and

---

[42]. Martin Buber, BMM, pp.240-42.

Rarest Archiver

the freedom of person is achieved from it. A man becomes a true person only in communion with others. Hence, the human existence as person is realized and fulfilled only in the I-Thou relationship. The personality of man is the result of I-Thou relationship.

Buber contradicts the scholastic concept, which held that the personality of a person is an individual matter and simply social product. In Buber's opinion, to become a person is an achievement through many stages and levels; and it is through the relational meeting, one becomes a person and attains his personal nature. In and through the genuine and reciprocal relationship, a person realizes his uniqueness and unique potentialities within himself. Does the existence of a person depend on the existence of the other person?, is a question that can be paused to Buber; and Buber would answer to it a No. He maintains that one cannot be a person except in the I-Thou relationship. To support the view of Buber, Dr. Aloys Von Orelli uses the formula, 'The person, a relation'.

For the authentic personal existence, the realm of the 'Between man and man' is the most necessary factor in which one imparts oneself to the other as what one is. In the sphere of the 'between' the 'I' allows the other to partake with his own being. This is called the genuine personal existence without which the authentic human relationship is impossible. In such a type of relationship, there is no show or pretence.[43]

Each of the persons in such a type of mutual relationship fulfills and achieves the dynamic glory of one's personal existence. A genuine community can exist only when person relates to one another in true genuiness. In Charles Hunter's opinion, becoming persons in relationship, we discover the

---

[43]. Martin Buber, KM,pp.77-78.

Rarest Archiver

persons of our fellowmen. A genuine personality exists only between persons in relation.[44]

3.6. THE SPHERE OF THE 'BETWEEN' OR THE 'INTERHUMAN

Between man and man and the interpersonal is the primal reality in which man achieves his real being. In the sphere of the 'between' the essence of human existence is rooted in one's turning to another and in communion with the other. Two persons meet each other in the sphere of the between in which the dimension of the relational meeting opens up that is common to both of them but which also reaches out beyond the special sphere of each. This is the sphere of the 'between'.[45]

The sphere of the 'between' cannot be sought neither in subjective nor in the objective sphere, because it is a dimension that comes into being only in an intimate relationship when two human beings happen to each other. This is accessible only to the two persons who engage themselves in an encounter; and the reality is not within the persons who enter into relationship but between them. The sphere of the between is the primal category of human reality in which a genuine third alternative begins. Hence, it is on the narrow ridge where the I and Thou meet, there is the realm of the 'Between'. Though Buber had maintained in his work 'Daniel', that the I-IT and I-Thou relations are subjective, yet in his 'Ich und Du' he clarified that the I-Thou relationship does not belong to the sphere of subjectivity but it is grounded in the sphere of the 'between'. The sphere of the 'between' is a special category which is more difficult to comprehend than the other two categories, viz., 'distance' and 'relationship'. Buber agrees with Marcel who also holds that 'between' is something more mysterious that cannot be defined in an

---

44. Martin Buber, Pointing the Way, pp.155-56.
45. Martin Buber, BMM,pp.244-46.

Rarest Archiver

arithmetical or geometrical languages. In the long run, the human spirit cannot do without it;[46] and it is the primal category of human reality.[47]

According to Theunissen, the concept of the 'between' is the key concept which opens the whole of Buberian philosophy of relationship. The concept of the 'between' cannot be taken as a separate category or independent category of the basic concept of relationship. The relationship may sound to be psychological but the 'between' mean an ontic sphere which points to a non-psychic realm of human existence.[48]

Buber strongly opines that there is an ontological quality in the 'between' and what happens in it. His own words are, "what happens there cannot be reached by psychological concepts, it is something ontic. The relational situation can be adequately grasped only in an ontological way. The sphere of the 'between' has its being between the two persons in relationship and it transcends both. On the far side of subjective and objective, on the narrow ridge where I and Thou meet, there is the sphere of the between".[49]

'Between' is an important relationship between two persons.[50] The relationship of 'between' as the 'interhuman' comes between the I and Thou and it does not describe the psychological contents of the persons. It describes of what happens between persons in communicating to one another. In the 'interhuman' there is the dynamism between persons as in 'we'.[51]

---

46. Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp.707-708.
47. Martin Buber, BMM, pp. 244-245.
48. Martin Buber, KM, pp.84-85.
49. Martin Buber, BMM, pp. 246-247.
50. Martin Buber, KM,pp. 72-73.
51. Ibid., pp. 107-108.

Rarest Archiver

But we do not find a correct and precise definition of the 'interhuman' in Buber's philosophy of relationship.

Buber opines that an existential relationship lacks between one member and the other in the social bond or in a group association.[52] The norm of a group association is the collective element, in which persons are carried away by the collectivity; and though group association lifts them out of loneliness, yet, the sense of being and value of the person is lost in it. But in the 'interhuman' or the 'between' the relationship of the particular Thou happens and each of the partners is a living event of encounter.[53]

The interhuman relationship does not mean sympathy or psychological event or comradely relationship but much more than that. In the interhuman relationship something actually happens in the actual encounter of two partners of I-Thou relationship; and both the partners live together in relational reality that unfolds the relationship.[54]

In the realm of the 'interhuman' the actualization of the I-Thou relationship takes place between the partners; and the 'interhuman' is something that takes place between two persons from time to time.[55] Buber characterized the 'interhuman' as a sphere of truth and spontaneity. The truth in the interhuman realm takes a bodily power and in it men relate themselves to one another as they are; and in it one has a share in the being of the other.[56]

Thus, there arises the possibility of 'directness' between partners in relationship;[57] and this is the question of the

---

52. Ibid., pp.72-74.
53. Ibid., pp. 74-75.
54. Ibid., pp. 75-76.
55. Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, PMB, pp.711-712.
56. Martin Buber, KM, (1965), pp. 77-78.
57 Ibid., pp. 84-85.

Rarest Archiver

authenticity of the interhuman.[58] In the interhuman relationship, there is no tendency toward mere appearance but each partner means and make present himself in his personal being to the other and does not impose himself on the other.[59]

3.7. THE 'I' MORE CONCRETELY AND THE TWOFOLD 'I'

Buber maintains that there is no I taken in itself but only the I of the primary word I-Thou and the I of the primary word I-IT; and when a man says I, he refers to one or other of these. The I to which man refers is present when he says I. The existence of I and the speaking of I are one and the same thing. The I of man is both the I of the I-IT and the I of the I-Thou and thus the I of man is twofold.[60]

Man's two basic relations to the world are fundamentally different modes of self-expression and so the 'I' in these relations has radically different meanings. The I of the I-IT is spoken where and when the beings around are observed and treated as mere objects of observation; and the I of the I-Thou relationship is spoken where and when one stands with the whole of one's being over against another and enters into essential relationship with him.[61]

It is to enter into the relationship with the other, when the I says Thou, and when the I says IT, it is to take him to be an object. At this, Anzenbacher objects to twofold I's of Buber as, 'can there be two I's corresponding to human experience? Through the way of clarification, Buber answers to this question and maintains that when we say that out of the I-Thou relationship another I emerges than out of the I-IT relation, here a different I actualizes itself, then to be sure

---

58. Ibid., pp.77-78.
59. Ibid., pp. 84-85.
60. Martin Buber, IT, (1919), pp.15-16.
61. Martin Buber, EG, (1958), pp. 128-129.

Rarest Archiver

it is correct to understand this as the self-realization of the I through his awareness.[62]

The I of the I-It is monological I in the world of science, the I of the I-Thou is relational and existential I of the encounter which occurs in the present and past. The I of the primary word of I-Thou is Thou in encounter which addresses and responds to it in interpersonal relation alone. The I of the I-IT is Eigenwesen or which appears as individual and the I of I-Thou is 'Hinwendun' or goes out of itself to meet a Thou as person.[63]

It is the only I, that says Thou is the real person and in this measure only when the I says Thou it becomes a personal I, an actual and real I. Thus the union of I and Thou is based on this reality. Buber says that the I is actual through its participation in actuality of I-Thou relationship. Man has existence as man, becomes man and participates in this actuality, only in being related to his Thou. Though the I may step out of the event of the relational relationship, yet the participation in the I-Thou relationship still remain in it as a living potentiality. Therefore Buber calls it as the realm of subjectivity in which the I apprehends simultaneously its association and its detachment. The spiritual substance of the person matures in this subjectivity alone.

3.8. THE I AND THOU

The question about the principle of human existence falls into the realm of anthropology. The human existence constitutes man as a special category of being in the world unlike the animals.[64] Though animals have environment (Umvelt) that constitutes many things and concerns the total situations, man

---

62. Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, PMB, pp. 695-96.
63. Martin Buber, BMM, (1961), pp. 41-42.
64. Martin Buber, KM, pp. 60-62.

Rarest Archiver

alone has world. The animals are conditioned by their surroundings and needs but only man is able to condition his world by rising above his necessities, though the world at times may condition him. Man as free being has correlation between himself and the world. Through his freely determined attitude or a fundamental posture of setting oneself towards the world, man realizes his existence. Thus man's existence is dynamic in actuality.

The fundamental posture or attitude of man towards the world is twofold and Buber's philosophy of relationship is essentially concerned with this. Buber begins with the assertion that "To man the world is twofold, in accordance with his twofold attitude". The twofold attitude of man are, "I-Thou and I-IT which represent the authentic and unauthentic attitudes of man.[65]

As Buber often speaks the twofold character of the world, the term 'world' is used in varying and interrelated connotations. While the world means the totality of beings and man's total relation to it as it appears, man, by standing over against it in twofold attitude determines his correlation to it. Thus, man's being itself becomes twofold and through twofoldness of speech or language the twofold character of his attitude is manifested by which he meets his world.

The twofold character of man's attitude shows the twofold nature of his existence through his relationship to whatever he meets. His twofold attitudes are two primary words that he speaks as I-Thou and I-IT. These terms are not isolated words but are relational terms and the world exists for man as an I-Thou or I-IT world.[66]

---

[65]. Martin Buber, IT, (1994), p. 15.
[66]. Ibid., p. 15.

Rarest Archiver

Among the twofold nature of man's attitude, one is a 'realizing' and the second is an 'orienting' attitude of man. While the first attitude i.e., the I-Thou relational and reciprocal that involves detachment, whereas the second one i.e., the I-IT attitude is an objective presenceless, objectification, orientation and of monological attitude.[67]

The world of I-Thou and I-IT are inextricable interwoven and interrelated. Man enters into relationship by using the primary world of I-Thou through which alone human existence is realized. When man says I he refers to one or the other of I-Thou or I-IT and when he says Thou or IT, the I of one of the two primary words is present. The existence of I and the speaking of I are one and the same thing; and when primary word is spoken, the speaker enters the word and takes his stand in it.[68]

An 'I' wholly for itself is an abstraction and an unreality. At the presence of something that stands over against him, man becomes his I. The 'I' of man comes into being by act of speaking one or the other of the primary words of I-Thou or I-IT. The primary word I-Thou is spoken with the whole being, because to say Thou is to stand with the whole being over against another and enter into an essential relationship defined as the ontical participation of the partners in the life of each other.[69]

The realm of I-Thou has different basis which points to a relationship between person and person, subject and subject, a reciprocal relationship that involves meeting of two persons in utter genuiness. Buber's own words are, "When Thou is spoken, the speaker has no thing for his object. When Thou is spoken

---

[67]. Martin Buber, Philosophical Interrogations, pp. 115-116.
[68]. Martin Buber, IT,(1994), p. 16.
Martin Buber, BMM, pp. 207-208.

Rarest Archiver

there is no thing; he has indeed nothing but he takes his stand in relation".[70]

The relationship in the I-Thou is immediate and the I speaks with the other in address with his whole being. In the I-Thou relationship, man does not possess the other as something but stands to the other in personal and reciprocal relationship. The manner of the relation or the quality called 'betweenness' determines man's attitude towards the persons and the world. Buber clarifies the distinction between the two primary words of I-Thou and I-IT. He says, "What I mean is that when man presents himself to the world or in general to others (Thous), when he takes up an attitude, when he speaks a primary word I-Thou and I-IT, it is either the one of the other postures he takes; and in it man actualizes either the one I or the other I".[71]

Although, in Buber there is no clear-cut division between the I-Thou and I-IT worlds, these I-Thou and I-IT attitudes represent two quiet different worlds. He replied to the American philosopher William Poteat in this way," I do not say that the world is twofold, rather the world is twofold to man. I do not say anything concerning anything existing independently of man".[72]

3.09.WORLD OF I AND THOU

The I-thou is one of relationship and communion in which a person relates with others with his whole person and being. When a man faces the other human being as his Thou and says, I-Thou to him, the other is not a thing among things; he steps into direct relationship with the other. The I-Thou relation means being chosen and choosing, suffering and action in one.

---

[70]. Martin Buber, IT, pp,. 16-17.
[71]. Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, PMB, pp. 692-693.
[72]. Maurice Friedman, Buber's Life and Works, (1982), p. 426.

Rarest Archiver

Concentration and fusion into whole being can never take place through one's agency nor can it ever take place without him. Buber's own worlds are," I become through my relation to the Thou; as I become I, I say Thou".[73]

In the I-Thou, there is the establishment of meeting and communion of relationship between one who addresses and one who is addressed; and the relationship is a genuine relationship of realization in which both the parties confront each other as subjects. The person, by saying, 'Thou' establishes the relationship of sharing, community and encounter. In the 'question to the Single One', Buber says, that the I-Thou relationship is the authentic world of relationship and in it, the genuine reality opens itself to the person when he says Thou with his whole being to the beings living around him.[74] "As I become I, I say Thou".[75] Thou is required to become an I and I becomes I only in the presence and relationship with a Thou.

E.Levinas raised an objection to Buber asking, "Is my partner as Thou is necessary for my existence?". Buber clarifies this concept by maintaining that 'the I is not the product of the Thou and neither the Thou is the cause of the I, but rather it is the prerequisite for the full realization of the I. It is not my existence that I owe to Thou but my relationship to the Thou. He is my Thou only in the relationship and outside this relationship between us he, as this Thou does not exit".[76]

The I of a person stands over against the other as his Thou in the horizon of his personal existence; and in the real presence of his Thou, the Thou itself is recognized to be an I.

---

[73]. Martin Buber, IT, pp. 21,24,25.
[74]. Martin Buber, BMM,pp. 79-80.
[75]. Martin Buber, IT,p.25.
[76]. Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, PMB, pp.697-98.

Rarest Archiver

The I-Thou world is one of authentic, reciprocal, direct, present and involving relationship in which the personal and personality of I really exists. In the I-Thou relationship there is the becoming of the soul (self), the unified I and the concentration of power of the beings of I and Thou. In the I-Thou world, there is immediacy, mutuality and presentness; and the space, time and causality are irrelevant here. Thus, Buber says, "When the Thou is spoken, the speaker has nothing, he has indeed nothing. But he takes his stand in relationship".[77]

The I-Thou world cannot be set in the context of space and time nor subjected to abstraction but we enter into intersubjective engagement with the other. In this reciprocal relationship, one receives, discloses and surrenders himself to the other. No deception may penetrate here which is the cradle of the real life.[78] The other in the world of I-Thou is regarded as this man, this one and one's partner.[79]

The I-Thou world does not require a system of coordination and Thou in it cannot be categorized. And further in the sphere of the 'Between' the world of I-Thou is a 'product of meeting' which arises from the contact of being with the being of the other.[80]

The I-Thou world is one of realization that does not know security as in the I-IT world where uncertainty, danger may exist. The world of I-Thou may involve risks yet there is the freedom and realization. Thus, Buber says in his 'Daniel' that in this form of life, every thing, every meeting, and every event takes on a new meaning, where life finds fulfillment and

---

77. Martin Buber , IT,p. 17.
78. Ibid., p. 22.
79. Martin Buber, KM,pp. 79-80.
80. Ibid., pp. 156-57.

Rarest Archiver

unity.[80] Further Buber maintains that in the world of I-Thou, the personal lives in relationship, with which the I has an unarbitrary relationship.[82] In the world of I-Thou relationship, only in virtue of one's power to enter into relationship with the other, he is able to live in the spirit.[83] The spirit is not in the I but between I and Thou. So, Buber says, "The spirit is not like the blood that circulates in us but like the air that we breath".[84] In the world of I-Thou relationship, through the Thou man becomes I which stands to the reality of relationship.[85]

Buber opines that the reality of I-Thou is fleeting and one may encounter Thou unexpectedly and lose his Thou again without the prior warning in the relationship. The transition of the I-Thou relationship to the I-IT is an inevitable factor and for man to walk permanently in the I-Thou relationship is impossible always. Every Thou in the world is by its nature fated to become a thing or continually to reenter into the condition of things.[86]

Buber says, "The world of Thou is not set in the context of space and time. The particular Thou, after the relational event has run it course is bound to become IT. The particular IT, by entering the relational event may become a Thou"[87] which may happen through grace alone. Hence, the actuality and latency with alteration are constant in the regular life of man and of beings in the world.

---

80. Martin Buber, Daniel, pp. 55-83.
82. Martin Buber, KM,pp. 102-103.
83. Martin Buber, IT,p. 58.
84. Ibid., pp. 57-58.
85. Ibid., p.44.
86. Ibid., pp. 31-32.
87. Ibid., p.50

Rarest Archiver

Man can live continuously and securely in the I-IT world and can only live in actual and potential I-Thou relationship. When man enters over and over again into the reality of the I-Thou relationship, it is consummated only in the direct relation with the Eternal Thou (God) that by its by nature cannot become IT;[88] and He is above this alternating law.

3.10. THE I AND THOU RELATIONSHIP AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS

The I-Thou relationship is specifically personal relationship and bond between two persons. To be is to related to and everything in the world is being with others. In the beginning is relation as category of being, readiness, grasping form, mould for the soul; it is *a priori* of relation, the *inborn Thou*, which is realized in the lived relations of I-Thou with that which meets it.[89]

In the I-Thou relationship the I with his whole being enters into an act of relationship with complete power of his soul; and there cannot be any internal contradiction of conflict between the two in relationship.[90]

The true life of man is expressed in terms of personal I-Thou relationship and so Buber says, "IN THE beginning is relationship".[91] The feeling and understanding between two persons are bridged in the I-Thou relationship; and in every singular function of I (Soul) the act of relationship is contained. The life from one's being and the vital reality of life is implied in the I-Thou relationship.[92] The two beings disclose their self to each other from the depth of their being in the state of fellowmanliness only through the I-thou relationship. The two

---

88. Ibid., p.99.
89. Ibid., p. 43.
90. Martin Buber, Philosophical Interrogations, pp. 52, 53, 82-83.
91. Martin Buber, IT, p.32.
92. Martin Buber, BM, pp. 75-77.

Rarest Archiver

partners interact personally with each other in an intimate communion that can only be described and not explainable. The I-Thou relationship takes place in comradeship, love trust, greeting, respect and stirring sympathy between the two partners. In the I-Thou relationship there are no gifted or ungifted but only those who give themselves.[93] The radical responsibility, decision and basic trust are the characteristics of the I-Thou relationship and even the head of a large business enterprise can build the I-Thou relationship with his thousands of employees. Thus Buber would put it, "No deception penetrates here; here is the cradle of the real life.[94]

In the I-Thou relationship both subjective moment of freedom and the supra-subjective moment of grace are interrelated; and in one sense grace consists in the situation of it. The immediacy is the unique characteristic of I-Thou relationship and it is the quality of presence that holds place in this relationship. The heart of personal life attains its fullness only in the personal relationship with other; and through such relationship we can glimpse into eternity. This uncontrollable relationship depends on the reciprocal movement of both partners and touches the core of the life of both. Buber's own words are, "The I-Thou relationship bears the mark of a mystery and in the reality of a timeless moment the mystery of togetherness opens up; [95] and in such relationship the one who is a man beside man becomes a fellowman who lives over against the I the uncanny primary word.[96]

---

[93]. Martin Buber, BMM, pp,54-56.
[94]. Martin Buber, IT, p. 22.
[95]. Ibid., p. 31.
[96]. Ibid., p.51.

Rarest Archiver

The physical time is taken away in the presence of the I-Thou and without contradictions it is the Thou alone that becomes important. The time in such relationship can be judged only that Thou with I in relationship alone.[97]

The I-Thou relationship is the life of man in the spirit and the spirit is that something that happens without being expected. The spirit is something that happens between I and Thou which is a response of one to another that is manifested in the mystery of I-Thou. Thus Buber says, "SPIRIT IN its human manifestation is a response of man to his Thou. Man speaks with many tongues of language, of art, of action; but the spirit is one, the response to the Thou which appears and addresses him out of the mystery.[98]

In Buber's most concrete proposition, "THERE IS no I taken in itself, but only the I of the primary word I-Thou".[99] Through the I-Thou system, man rediscovered his spiritual communion with others. While the I-IT is merely functional and instrumental, the I-Thou is distinctively personal. The I-Thou brings out mysterious imprint of "I" i.e., in person and personality, which is the essential identity of a person. The present momentariness is also one of the main characteristics of I-Thou in which a person attains his reality of personality in actuality and potentiality.

Ibid., p.45.
Ibid., p. 57; Cf. also. Martin Buber, Autobiographical Fragments, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 36-37.
Ibid., p. 16.

Rarest Archiver

MYSORE

CHAPTER—4

THE 'THOU'

4.0. INTRODUCTION

Martin Buber published a small volume in 1923 which was entitled as 'Ich und Du' and has been described as one of the epoch-making books of this generation; and Joseph Oldham said about this book in these words, "I question whether any book has been published in the present century, the message of which if it were understood and heeded, would have such far-reaching consequences for the life our times". As Gabriel Marcel had initially expressed it the use of the second person singular; the German 'Du' (in French 'Tu') is especially significant since it denotes a loving familiarity, a togetherness and unreserved intimacy that cannot be conveyed by the English pronoun 'you'.

Ronald Gregor Smith, the English translator of 'Ich und Du' maintains that he tried to convey the special nuance of 'Du' by using the archaic English pronoun 'Thou'. He did this, fully conscious of the possible misunderstanding the particular choice of word might occasion in the minds of his readers. He states, "It was indeed with some misgivings, yet seemed to me unavoidable that I gave the book in English the title that I did. "Thou" has through the very fact of its survival as an uncommon usage, reserved for prayer, tended to heighten the danger of secularization. But there is in Buber's whole thought no suggestion of a return to a metaphysic which sees a double order of being, the immanent and the transcendent, in which the transcendent is understood as being somehow imposed upon the 'natural' or immanent order".[1]

---

[1]. Francis J. Lescoe, Existentialism With or Without God, pp. 156-57.

Rarest Archiver

Walter Kaufman more recently had issued a new translation of Buber's 'Ich und Du' as 'I and You'. He rejects Ronald Gregor Smith's use of 'Thou' to 'Du' and insists that 'Du' should be translated as 'You' because German lovers do not say 'Thou' to one another; 'Thou' is not said spontaneously and it immediately brings God to mind. And further, 'Thou' is a preacher's word as well as dear to anticlerical poets. We find 'Thou' in Shakespeare and at home in English Bible. And so 'Thou' means many things and as non-literary term it is not spontaneous in human relationships.

Though Kaufmanns's observations seem to be right, yet Smith's 'Du' translated to 'Thou' has now acquired the additional meaning of 'Du'. Kaufmanns himself seem to acknowledge this fact, since he still retains the 'Thou' in the title of his newly translated work.

4.1. THE MEANING OF 'THOU' (THE OTHER)

The question of man, the wholeness of man, and the essential relationships between persons were the major principle concerns of Buberian philosophy. According to Buber, in order to come to know the essence of man (I) and to define his existence (dasein), one must consider him in his essential relationship to the 'other' (Thous) beings.[2]

The fundamental fact of human existence is man with man. What is peculiarly characteristic of human world above all is that something takes place between one being and another that cannot be found anywhere in the nature.[3] Man does not exist in isolation but exists anthropologically in the completeness of relationship to a Thou person. The 'I' exists only through the

---

Martin Buber, Between Man and Man, Trans. Ronald Gregor Smith, (Boston: Beacon Press. 1961), pp. 219-220. Hereafter it is cited as BMM.

Ibid., pp. 244-45.

Rarest Archiver

relationship to the 'Thou' or in other words it is 'man with man'. Only man with man provides a full image of a person, which is completely outlined form. We come nearer to the answer to the question of 'what is man?', when we come to see him as the eternal meeting of the one with the other.[4]

The 'I' comes into being only through the relationship to a Thou. The uniuqueness of man is to be found neither in the individual nor in the collective but in the meeting of I and Thou relationship. In the essential relationship between persons, one's life opens up to another so that one experiences the mystery of the other (Thou) being in the mystery of one's own. We know man truly, only when he realizes in his whole life with his whole being the relations possible with his Thou.[5] There is a two-fold movement in man in which he had the ability to distance himself from what is over against him and enters into relationship with it;[6] and this being is in the world who knows the universe as universe, its space as space, its time as time.[7] Thus, the essential I-Thou relationship is that which constitutes the authentic human existence. Buber says, "Humanity in general is essentially the human existence in entities of mankind which are bound together in generations and in society".[8] One can know the wholeness of the Thou (other) and with his subjectivity he enters into the inner personality of the Other (Thou) in relationship. Man, in order to become aware of human wholeness of the Thou, should completely enter into the act of self-reflection of the Thou and himself; and he has

---

4. Ibid., pp. 246-48.
5. Ibid., pp.240-41.
6. Martin Buber, The Knowledge of Man, Trans. Maurice Friedman & Ronald Gregor Smith, ed. Intro. Maurice Friedman, (New York: Harper &Row, 1965), pp. 60-61. Hereafter cited as KM.
7. Martin Buber, BMM,pp. 191-92.
. Ibid., pp.196-97.

Rarest Archiver

to enter into the reality of the Thou which is the reality of human existence.[9] Man, through the concrete situation of interpersonal relationship with his Thou, breaks open the fences that he has erected around himself and goes out to meet his Thou.[10]

4.2. THE INBORN THOU

Buber says, "IN THE beginning is relationship as the category of being, readiness, grasping form, mould for the soul; it is the *a priori* of relation, the *inborn Thou*.[11] The relationship is ontical reality and the I-Thou (other) is inborn in man. Buber says, "The inborn Thou is realized in the lived relations with that which meets it. In the instinct to make contact, first by touch and then by visual 'touch' of another being, the inborn Thou is soon brought to its full powers, so that the instinct evermore clearly turns out to mean mutual relation, tenderness. THROUGH THE Thou a man becomes I".[12]

Wood clarified the concept of Buber and maintained that man has an a priori relation to the other, inborn in the very structure of his nature and his being is being-toward, being out there with the other.[13] Hence Buber says, RELATION IS mutual, my Thou affects me as I affect it".[14]

The fundamental fact in human life is person-to-person relationship. In such relationship first of all there is an obscure consciousness then gradual distinction of I-Thou emerges. Paton supports this view of Buber and says, "I do not

---

9. Ibid., pp.153-57.
10. Ibid., pp.243-44
11. Martin Buber, I and Thou, Trans. Ronald Gregor Smith, (T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1994,), pp. 32, 43. Hereafter cited as IT.
12. Ibid., pp.43-44.
13. Wood, Martin Buber's Ontology, pp. 84-86.
14. Martin Buber, IT,p. 30.

Rarest Archiver

discover myself first and make an inference to the other (your) existence but the Thou (you) and I were there all the time and only gradually I is able to sort out himself in such relatioship.[15] Buber says, "The inborn Thou is realized in the lived relationship with that which meets it. This realization is based on the *'a priori'* of relationship that is the potentiality of relationship that exists between oneself and the world in encounter.[16] Hence, logically let us maintain that a priori relationship is the locus or the creative milieu wherein the inborn Thou is realized. So, Buber characterizes the a priori of relationship, the innate Thou as the 'innate capacity of man to confirm his fellowman.[17] Buber continues saying, "What teaches us the saying of Thou is not the originative instinct but the instinct for communion.[18] Thus, the capacity to say 'Thou' rests in the structure of human existence and Thou is inborn, inherited and gifted from creation. The very origin of being is I-Thou relationship. Buber says, "The antenatal life of the child is one of purely natural combination, bodily interaction and flowing from one to the other; for, it does not rest only in the womb of the human mother. There is the yearning for the cosmic connection with its true Thou, of this life that has burst forth into spirit.[19] When the child is born, this longing for connection with everything is gradually translated into spiritual terms as the longing to meet its Thou. Hence, through the meeting with the Thou, the child becomes an I in its relationship. The primitive man, the child and the world enjoy the unbroken force of unity

---

15. Paton, The Modern Predicament, pp. 163-64.
16. Martin Buber, IT,pp. 43-44.
17. Martin Buber, KM,pp. 68-69.
18. Martin Buber, BMM,pp.114-115.
19. Martin Buber, IT,pp. 40-41.

Rarest Archiver

between themselves.[20] The longing for relationship is primary in the case of a child and in the second stage, the actual relationship, a saying Thou without words, the thing like the I is produced later in the I-Thou relationship.[21] The I-Thou comes before consciousness and the I-IT comes after the self-consciousness and self-differentiation.

There is in every being an ontic longing and yearning for one's true Thou. This is the inborn Thou which is an ontological category of being which is also the *a priori* of relationship and the basis of man's ability to meet his Thou which stands over against him. Every being has a personal nature because at the root of every person there is the intrinsic longing for the other (Thou); and this longing for personal relationship with fellow beings is the basis in the very structure of human being. According to Berkovits, it is the nature of being within the person that longs for relationship and it is the same nature of person that reveals itself in the reciprocity of the encounter in relationship.[22]

The individual can become person only through the going out to meet and through being met the 'Other' (Thou). We live our lives inscrutably included within the streaming mutual life of the universe.[23] Human being finds meaning for his existence in the 'Between' unlike Buddha who maintained that human life itself is suffering and the meaningful goal of human is the release from SAMSARA-the wheel of life and death with its cycle of rebirths. Man finds meaning to his existence in the reality

---

20. Ibid., pp. 40-42.
21. Ibid., pp. 42-44.
22. Elizer Berkvits, A Jewish Critique of the Philosophy of Martin Buber in Studies in Torah Judaism, No.3, (New York: Yeschiva University, 1962), pp. 89-81.
23. Maurice Friedman, Martin Buber's Life and Work, (1982), p.330.

Rarest Archiver

of the spirit, which in human manifestation is a response to his Thou. All real living is said to be 'Meeting' the Thou.[24] The more personal, can rest in the relationship to the Thou (other). As regards the 'spiritual beings', though we perceive no Thou in them, yet, we feel that we are addressed and we answer. Even a piece of art by an artist is not his relationship to something fictitious but to something that is there, not as IT but only as his Thou.[25]

4.3. GOD THE ETERNAL THOU

According to Buber God is the 'Eternal Thou' whom man meets in the true life of relationship. The term, 'Eternal Thou' is not a substitutive word for the term 'God' that cannot be replaced by any word.[26] To clarify 'God', the 'Eternal Thou' is used. In each I-Thou relationship, the inborn is realized and it attains its perfection only in the direct relationship to the Eternal Thou (God). The Eternal Thou is addressed in each I-Thou encounter, because He is the power who enables the occurrence of every possible relational encounter; and the extended relational lines meet in the Eternal Thou. Every particular Thou (other) is a glimpse through to the Eternal Thou and by every means of every particular Thou, the primary word addresses God the Eternal Thou. The inborn Thou is realized in each relation and becomes consummated in the direct relation with the Eternal Thou which by its every nature cannot become IT; every particular Thou points beyond itself to God - the Eternal Thou.

Every Thou speaks of the Eternal Thou; and behind every Thou that we meet in the world, we meet the Eternal Thou who is the ground of all I-Thou relationship. Through the encountering

---

[24]. Ibid., pp. 331-32.
[25]. Ibid., pp. 332-35.
. Martin Buber, IT,p. 100.

Rarest Archiver

of each Thou, we address the Eternal Thou. Whatever that becomes present to us we see the train of God and in every genuine and true meeting the Eternal Thou is inclusive. We can perceive the breath of God (Eternal Thou) in every genuine I-Thou relational event. In each sphere of life of every particular Thou, we address the Eternal Thou. In each demand of the particular Thou upon us, and beyond this particular Thou we look and glimpse the Eternal Thou who is always and ever present to us. Any man can meet this Eternal Thou through any Thou who addresses God in any other name, because He is present in all true I-Thou encounters. The Eternal Thou is the ground of genuine I-Thou relationship and He gathers, fulfills and makes them all possible encounters.[27]

The real God is the God who addresses us in I-Thou relationship and He can be addressed in and through the genuine I-Thou relationship alone.[28] Though the Eternal Thou is met in each particular Thou, yet it cannot be fixed in any of them. The Eternal Thou is the present reality; therefore He cannot become IT.[29] Only in our existence as persons and in our encounter with the finite Thou's, we meet the Eternal Thou and we do not know anything of Him outside this relational encounter. In contrast to Kierkegaard, Buber maintained that there couldn't be I-Thou relationship with God for a man who turns away from his fellowman and the world.[30]

Malcom Diamond supports the view of Buber through the use of Plato's analogy of the Sun and explains that just like the Such which is the most visible reality among all objects and the source of objects that makes the other things to become

---

[27]. Martin Buber, IT,pp. 99.
[28]. Martin Buber, The Origin and Meaning of Hasidism, pp. 91-93.
[29]. Maurice Friedman, Op. Cit.,p. 354; Cf. also, Martin Buber IT, pp.99.
[30]. Ibid., p. 355.

Rarest Archiver

visible in the like manner the Eternal Thou (God) is the supreme partner and the power that underlies all the I-Thou relational encounter.[31]

As the Eternal Thou (God) has no place; He cannot be sought; but He can be encountered in and through I-Thou relationship. God is present in every single Thou. Thus Buber writes, "He who goes out with his whole being to meet his Thou and carries to it all being that is in the world finds Him who cannot be sought. If you explore the life of things and of conditioned being you come to the unfathomable, if you deny the life of things and of conditioned being you stand before nothingness, if you hallow this life you meet the living God.[32] The way for encountering the Eternal Thou lies in middle of this concrete world.

Buber writes, "God cannot be inferred in anything in nature, say, as its author or in history as its master or in the subject as the self that is thought in it. God is that Being who directly, nearly and lastingly over against us be properly addressed and not expressed.[33] Further Buber holds, 'He' spoken of God is a metaphor but when we speak of God as 'Thou', He is not metaphor. To put it in other words, God becomes just a 'myth' if we speak of Him outside man's actual I-Thou relationship. There is a difference between speaking about or of God and speaking to God. When we speak of God, we seem to turn Him into a being among many other existing beings or He becomes a thing among many other things. But when we speak to God, it means that we turn to Him with all our beings

---

31. Malcolm Diamond, Martin Buber, Jewish Existentialist, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968), pp.39-40 ; Cf. also, Malcolm Diamond, Dialogue and Theology in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 248-49.
32. Martin Buber, IT,p. 104; Maurice Friedman, Buber's Life and Work, (Search Press Ltd, 1982), p. 355.
33. Ibid., pp.105-106.

Rarest Archiver

while we address and respond to His address of I-Thou relationship.[34]

The existence of mutuality between God and man cannot be proved just as God's existence cannot be proved. But he who dares to speak of God bears witness and calls to witness Him to whom he speaks- may be the witness is now or in the future.[35] Further, in every sphere in its own way, through each process of becoming that is present to us, we look out toward the fringe of Eternal Thou; in each we are aware of a breath from the Eternal Thou and in each we address the Eternal Thou. Every sphere is compassed in the Eternal Thou, but He is not compassed in them.[36]

All the spheres and line of relationships merge in the Eternal Thou who is the ground of all I-Thou relationships, and he who is able to speak an unreserved Thou to his fellow man touches at the hem of the Absolute Thou. Ebner too maintains that God is the true Thou of man's true I and the spiritual ground of him.[37]

Eternal Thou alone is the only possible source of all authentic relational existences; and all the perfect manner of relationships and the characteristics of finite I-Thou relationships exist in Him. Even though one can abhor the name of God and believe himself to be godless, yet can address God when he gives his whole being to addressing the other as Thou. One who says, 'Thou', ultimately means his Eternal Thou. The Eternal Thou is the radical center of interhuman, the

---

[34]. Martin Buber, Autobiographical Fragments, in Schilpp, PMB, pp.24-25; Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp.713-14.
[35]. Martin Buber, IT,pp. 170-71.
[36]. Ibid., p. 130.
[37]. Ebner, Word an d Personality in Philosophy Today, 11 (Winter, 1967), pp.235-36.

Rarest Archiver

community, the society and the modern man can live in the Eternal Thou in spite of the threat of infinity.[38]

The Eternal Thou is the streaming life of the universe as speech and address, the source of all encounters and of real life. Everything is included in God and He is not included in the totality of all; He comprises the universe and the universe does not comprise Him.[39] Human I-Thou relationship becomes possible only because there is the Eternal[40] Thou who by His nature cannot become IT.

The Eternal Thou gives personal life and makes us as persons become capable of meeting with Him and with one another. No limitation can come upon Him (He is the Absolute person) either from us or from our relations with one another; and we can dedicate to Him our persons and our relations to one another. The I-Thou relationships can be properly brought and be fulfilled in the face of Eternal Thou.[41] Buber says that by His very nature, the Eternal Thou is Eternally Thou; and only our nature compels us to draw Him into the world and talk about Him.[42] The Eternal Thou, by His very nature cannot become IT and He cannot be established in measure and bounds or in the measure of the immeasurable or as the bounds of boundless being; He cannot be understood as a sun of qualities, not even as an infinite sum of qualities raised to a transcendental level. He can be found neither in nor out of the world; He cannot be experienced or thought. If we say," I believe that He is, we miss Him who is".[43]

---

38. Maurice Friedman, Op. Cit., p. 357.
39. Martin Buber, IT,p. 122.
40. Ibid., pp. 99,143.
41. Ibid., pp. 169-70.
42. Ibid., p. 128.
43. Ibid., p. 143.

Rarest Archiver

If the Eternal Thou is to be looked at as an object of use, He cannot be known as God. God is beyond human logical laws and man cannot have an adequate idea of God. God is the Thou of all Thous and He can be known through existential encounter that involves the whole being of the person in relationship.

In Buber's concrete understanding the God is the living God distinct from intellectual God of philosophers. The Eternal Thou is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the living God to whom one can say Thou.[44] The philosopher's God is necessarily an idea and an abstraction for discussion but the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob is not an idea, not even the highest idea but the real God who works in history and who encounters man in every moment of I-Thou relationship.[45]

Man calls Eternal God as the Eternal Thou. People wish to reject the word God as a legitimate usage because it is so misused. To term God indeed is the most heavily laden of all words used by people; therefore it is the most imperishable and most indispensable term.[46]

4.4. GOD AS PERSON

God is an Absolute Person only in line with the concept of I-Thou relational thought. God is the Being who becomes a person to us in order to know and be known, to love and to be loved by all human beings. God should be person in order to speak to man.

---

44. Maurice Friedman, Op. Cit., p. 358.
45. Martin Buber, Eclipse of God, Trans. Maurice Friedman, et. al, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1958, pp. 6-7,59-61; Martin Buber, On Judaism, pp. 5-6; Martin Buber, Israel and the World, pp. 52-53; Martin Buber Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 694-95.
46. Martin Buber, IT,pp. 99-100; Cf. also, Ebner, World & Personality in Philosophy Today, 11 (Winter, 1967), pp.236-37.

Rarest Archiver

God is neither an objective principle nor an idea, but He is a person because of His relationship with human beings. Whatever else God may be, He enters into a direct relationship with us men in creative, revealing and redeeming acts, and thus makes it possible for us to enter into a direct relation with Him.[47] God becomes a person through entering into direct relationship with men; HE becomes so in order to meet human beings. Hence, we speak of God as person in the religious language and I-Thou relationship. In our human mode of existence, the only reciprocal relationship that can exist is the personal one and so it is possible or permissible to speak that God became a person for love of us. Here it is not to mean to reduce Absolute to the personal level but rather it means that God has become addressable where He enters into I-Thou relationship as the Absolute person whom we all call Him God.[48]

The concept of personal being is indeed completely incapable of declaring what God's essential being is, but it is both permitted and necessary to say that God is also a person.[49] Spinoza too had the fear to describe God as a person because we would reduce Him to the personal alone. To dispel this Spinoza's fear, Buber maintains that it is both necessary and permissible to say that God is also a person. 'God' is in deliberate paradox as 'the Absolute Person', i.e., the person who cannot be limited.[50]

Though, God as the Absolute Person cannot be relativized or limited, among many attributes of God, being a person is one of the attributes that is directly known of God by man in his relationship. As person, the Absolute God enters into direct

---

47. Martin Buber, IT,p. 168.
48. Martin Buber, EG,pp.96-98.
49. Martin Buber, IT,pp. 168-69.
50. Ibid., p. 169; Cf. also, Sevilla. God as Person, pp. 86-89;Cf. also, Maurice Friedman, Op. Cit.,p. 355.

Rarest Archiver

relationship with human beings; and He loves man as a person and whishes that men too love Him as a person. If the Absolute God were not a person in Himself, He would not become one in creating man in order to love and be loved by Him, in order to love us and be loved by us.[51]

God can be encountered and known only though direct relationship of concreteness and communion. Here it should not be understood that we can know God as He is and in His being. Thus Herbert W. Schneider hastily concludes maintaining that for Buber, God is a person not in essence but only in relationship.[52] But, Will Herberg clearly understands the mind of Buber and holds that there is no God beyond the God of the divine human I-Thou relational encounter.[53] Thus in Buberian philosophy, God exists in relational encounters alone and He is to be understood only in reference to His creation, i.e., in His concrete relationship with all his creatures in creation.

According to the Old Testament of the Bible, God manifests Himself as a person, converses, encounters and addresses the people as a whole and calls them to enter into living I-Thou relationship with Him. God is not a solitary Being who looks down on his creatures from above as His objects but rather He Himself takes the initiative in inviting men to enter into personal relationship with Him, in which Himself in known as a person, the person par excellence. Hence, the definition of human person cannot be applied to God because the definition of man has limitations of a creature in nature. God is the I and we are the Thous in relationship. He takes first initiative to address man and creates him as an independent opposite and

---

51. Martin Buber, EG,pp. 60-61; Cf. also. Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith, pp. 164-66.
52. Herbert W. Schneider, The Historical Significance of Buber's Philosophy, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 473-74
53. Will Herberg, Writings of Martin Buber, pp,. 27-28.

Rarest Archiver

partner in relationship who can be capable of responding to Him and enter into free relationship with Him. Man is a creation of God as His partner for relationship. God gives man his independent existence and helps and induces his growth into a person; and by bringing him into existence, He makes possible man's encounter with Him and with fellowmen possible. Hence, man is made possible to recognize himself as an I and to say Thou to God, who stands face to face with him in encounter.[54]

By entering into reciprocal relationship with the Absolute God, man recognizes himself as a really free person. Man is not an object of God's thought but a partner in relationship with Him and in relation to this Absolute God (Person), man has meaning to his existence.

4.5. GOD AND MAN RELATIONSHIP

In Buber's system, the I-Thou relationship between God and man and man's relation to his fellowman is the primary reality. The relationship between God-man-fellowman is essentially similar because they show or specify the direct turning of I to Thou; and they find their fulfillment in actual reciprocity of relationship.[55] The above relationships are closely interconnected like the two great commandments of the Bible, "The love of God and the love of one's neighbour".[56]

There is the most intensive form of I-thou relationship between God and man; and the living encounter with God is the pure I-Thou relationship. We open ourselves to the unconditional mystery of God only when we encounter in each and every sphere of human life and of nature.[57] Through entering into I-Thou

---

[54]. Martin Buber, Hasidism, pp. 96-97; Cf. also, Sevilla, God as Person, pp.102-103.

[55]. Martin Buber, IT, pp. 108-109; Cf. also, Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp.694-95.

[56]. R.S. V. Bible, Mt. 22: 38-40.

[57]. Martin Buber, Israel and the World, pp. 49-50.

Rarest Archiver

relationship in every sphere of everything that confronts us, we encounter the Being of God (Eternal Thou) Himself as presence. God's presence radiates all spheres of reality, which we encounter. God manifests in all these and we address Him in saying Thou to any of these spheres. We stand over against God from birth to death.[58]

God is the personal God who speaks to man at every moment of his life and in every Thou man encounters the demand of God. The three spheres of relationships such as, life with nature, with fellow beings, with spiritual beings' lead man to encounter God. God's presence as divine presence is real, and it is ever demanding relationship and a presence as power.[59] Pro.Lotz maintains that in the encounter with God all encounters with nature, with man and with others have specific meaning and significance.[60] In the decisive point of God and man relationship, God is present to us, but only we are not always there in His presence.[61] Though God is the 'Wholly Other",[62] yet, He requires a total commitment from man's part. Hence, this is the paradoxical character of God-man relationship.[63]

When man disposes and opens up himself totally to the other with his whole being, then only he has entered into relationship with God. In Buber's understanding, all God's names are hallowed in I and Thou because in them God is not

---

58. Martin Buber, IT, pp. 130-32, 167.
59. Ibid., pp. 140-41; Cf. also, Berkovits, A Jewish Critique, pp. 10-12.
60. Prof. Lotz, The Problem of Loneliness, pp. 104-106.
61. Martin Buber, Israel and World, pp. 30-31; Cf. also, Berkovits, A Jewish Critique, pp. 80-83.
62. Martin Buber, IT,p. 104; Cf. also, Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., (1982),p. 355.
63. Ibid., p. 169

Rarest Archiver

merely spoken about but also spoken to.[64] In the I-Thou relationship with God and man, the unconditional exclusiveness and unconditional inclusiveness are one. When man enters into Absolute relationship, everything is gathered up in such relationship.[65]

In this exclusiveness and inclusiveness of relationship between God and man, the relationship is reciprocal. Man stands over against God as an independent partner in relationship. God needs man for the reciprocity between the two. Man needs God for the fulfillment, meaning of his life, and for the meaning in the world.[66] Buber says, "You need God, in order to be - and God needs you for the very meaning of your life".[67]

Though we cannot prove the existence of God, yet everyone can give witness to it through mutual relationship. In God-man relationship there are two sides and man knows only his side of relationship with God. Man, though cannot understand other side, yet can find the sings of the Absolute in his existence with other fellowmanly relationship. Buber's own words are, "We have to be concerned, to be troubled, not about the other side but about our own side, not about grace but about will".[68]

The world and the life in the world for man are not an obstacle in his way to God but they are the way for him. There is nothing in the world that can separate man from God's relationship. So Buber says, "Men do not find God if they leave the world. He who goes out with his whole being to meet his

---

64. Maurice Friedman, Op. Cit., p. 359; Cf. also, The Great Ideas Today, (Britannica Great Books, 1967), p.317.
65. Martin Buber, IT,p. 103.
66. Ibid., p. 147.
67. Ibid., p. 107.
68. Ibid., pp. 100-101.

Rarest Archiver

Thou and carries to it all being that is in the world, finds Him who cannot be sought".[69]

The relationship to God begins for man only in his earthly I-Thou relationships and in his humble service to his fellowbeings. One cannot answer the lifelong address of God without answering at the same time to the other who is entrusted to him.[70] Here man's direct relationship to God is not disregarded but the emphasis is laid on the essential relationship to God that should find its complement in the essential man-to-man relationship.[71]

The entire world is the language of God addressed to human beings that takes place in and through the normal course of everyday life of humanbeings. Everyday human life, the events and even nature reveal and speak of God's creating, self-communicating aspect, power and glory.

Hence, the whole life of man is a constant relationship between God and man. The relationship between God and man is a relationship between heaven and earth. Creation is, of being and of becoming is an act of the address of I-Thou relationship of God. As it is mentioned in the Holy Bible, God speaks and the world is created; and it is the sign of God's I-Thou relationship.[72]

As the history of the world is a God-man relationship, God invites man to be His true and authentic partner and he is empowered to respond independently with his whole being to his

---

69. Ibid., p. 104; Cf. also, Maurice Friedman, Op. Cit., p. 355.
70. Martin Buber, BMM,pp.83-84; Cf. also. Wood, The Self and the Other, in Philosophy Today, 10, (1963), pp.54-55.
71. Martin Buber, IT,pp. 168-170; Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp. PMB, pp. 710-711;Cf. also, Martin Buber, Hasidism, pp. 170-71.
72. R. S.V. Bible, Genesis:1.

Rarest Archiver

creator.[73] God has created man for Himself as His partner who is capable of entering into relationship with Him and with one another. In every small and great concrete situations and events that occur, man finds God addressing him with His unmistakable I-Thou relationship.[74] And the ultimate meaning of man's life lies in his relationship to God who makes his life of I-Thou possible.[75]

Man stands in his personal relationship to God that is the ultimate and the primary relationship which constitutes him as man. Man can be truly understood as man only in the light of this divine dimension; and he becomes truly a person, perceives the truth about himself and of others only through divine relationship.

4.6. BIBLICAL RELATIONSHIP OF GOD AND MAN

Buber teaches that religion springs out now from the theory of I-Thou relationship between God and man. Religion is said to be a continuous I-Thou relational meeting between God and man in the human history. Religion is the summons of God and man's response to Him.[76] The definition of religious faith is the I-Thou relationship in which man meets God who is the wholly other and present; and man responds to this God's self-revealing initiative.[77]

The Bible is the old record of the I-Thou relational experience of Israelites with their God YHAWEH; and this experience of Israelites is said to be the witness of a

---

[73]. Maurice Friedman, Op. Cit.,pp. 426-27, 370.
[74]. Martin Buber, Israel and the World, pp. 32-34; Cf. also, Berkovits, A Jewish Critique, pp. 13-15.
[75]. Martin Buber, IT,p. 99.
[76]. Martin Buber, Israel and the World, pp. 78-81.
[77]. Martin Buber, EG,pp. 52-53; Cf. also, Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith, pp. 165.

Rarest Archiver

thousand year old relationship between the I speaking of God and Thou of the hearing chosen Israelites.[78]

The very foundation and essence of Biblical faith and religion is the I-Thou relationship between God and man. God is the Eternal 'I' who is in search of a Thou (man) to whom He would finally say, 'YOU',[79] and man would respond to Him ; further man is the 'I' who can say Thou to his God. In such I-Thou relationship both God and man stand face to face with each other and have intercourse with each other.[80]

The I-Thou philosophy establishes itself on the Biblical faith of God-man relationship. The encounter of Israelites with their God as the Lord of the world in the human history is the constant theme that runs through all the books of the Bible. The meaning of history in the Bible is a relationship between the people of Israel as the chosen race and their God Yahweh, where the relationship is reciprocal. There are descriptions of the various stages of I-thou relationships between God and His people in which God demands a loving response of I-Thou from them.[81] God is the relational partner in human history and not just like an object of knowledge in the Bible. Hebrew Bible speaks of the human relationship as relationship between above, below, heaven and earth.[82]

In character, the ten commandments of the Bible are God and man relationship and they are spoken by an I (God) to a Thou (man). Every one of the commandments beings with an I and

---

78. Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith, pp 54-55.
79. Maurice Friedman, Op. Cit.,p. 427.
80. Martin Buber, The Origin and Meaning of Hasidism, pp. 91-93.
81. Martin Buber, Biblical Leadership, in the Writings of Martin Buber, ed. Will Herberg, (Cleveland: Meridian Book, 1956), pp. 224-25; Cf. also, Sevilla, God as Person, pp. 115-117.
82. Martin Buber, On Judaism, pp. 214-16; Cf. also, Schaeder, Martin Buber, pp. 228-29.

Rarest Archiver

are related to a personal Thou.[83] The heart and soul of Decalogue is the God-man I-Thou relation and in such relationship Israelites as a chosen community called upon to sanctify itself in community of people.

Whatever God is, He is the one who enters into a direct relationship with us men through creative, revelatory and redemptive acts and thereby makes it possible for us to enter into direct relationship with Him.[84]

The Bible describes that the I-Thou relationship between creator and the created is the creation and man finds his continuous I-Thou relationship with God and humanity in the world; the redemption is possible between God and man's actions. Thus, the work of redemption is the work of God and man.

The Biblical revelation tells only as God IS and not what His essence is; through personal revelation, God manifests Himself to humanity. The revelation also manifests the certainty of the presence of the hidden God and man's meeting with Him. The revelation gives only the presence of God (Being) that IS and not its contents or formulated realities that cannot be formulated in the intellectual or logical forms. Buber's own words are, "Man receives and he receives not a specific content but a presence, a presence as power".[85] As regards the revelation, the prophets testify to the fact that God communicates of Himself only; and in revelation we experience the person of God who comes to us, relates and discloses to us. Thus Buber says, " we have come near to God, but not nearer to unveiling the being or solving its riddle;

---

[83]. Martin Buber, On the Bible, pp.118-19.
[84]. Martin Buber, IT,p. 168; Cf. also, Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp. PMB, pp. 710-711; Cf. also Maurice Friedman, Op. Cit.,pp. 367-371
[85]. Martin Buber, IT,p.140.

Rarest Archiver

and the revelation of God does not have Himself as object".[86] The Eternal revelation is here and now and the word of revelation is 'I am that I am; that which reveals is that which reveals, that which is IS; the Eternal contact persists and the eternal voice sounds forth.[87]

A new interpretation is given to the mysterious answer to Yahweh to Moses in the book of the Exodus of the Bible as, "I am what I am",[88] but Buber interpreted it as," I Shall be there as there I shall be".[89] Hence, the Biblical verb means here as happening, coming into being, being there and being present etc. God identifies Himself as the presence and promises to Israelites to be with them to help them not through any determined or particular appearance of His form.[90]

God starts revelation and man is required to complete it; in such revelation the divine and human take part in mutual revelation. Man is given the work of responsibility to respond to the revelation of God.[91] God's covenant with Israelites in revelation has the supreme instance of characterization of I-

---

86. Ibid., p. 142; Cf. also, Martin Buber, BMM, (1961), pp. 73-74; Cf. also, Paul Tillich, Jewish Influences in Contemporary Christian Theology, in Cross Currents , II, No. 3, (Spring, 1952), pp. 36-43.
87. Ibid., pp.142-44
88. R.S. V. Bible, Exodus. 3:14.
89. Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith, pp. 28-29; Cf. also, Martin Buber, 'MOSES, The Revelation and the Covenant, pp. 113-115.
90. Martin Buber, IT, (1994), p. 144; Martin Buber, Kingship of God, Trans. R. Scheimann, (New York: Harper, 1962), pp. 105-106; Khon, Martin Buber, pp. 267-68; Martin Buber, MOSES,(Heidelberg: L. Schneider, 1962), pp. 51-55, 63-65; Cf. also, Martin Buber, On the Bible, pp. 58-60;
91. Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 698-99; Martin Buber, Israel and the World, pp. 22, 27-28.

Rarest Archiver

Thou relationship.[92] In and through a complete mutuality and reciprocity the I-Thou relationship results. There takes place the wholeness or the fullness of the real and mutual action in which both God and man are bound up in relationship. Man's life becomes heavier with inexpressible meaning.[93]

Vriezen raises objections against Buber and maintains that Buber oversteps the line and affirms that in I-Thou relationship between God and man, man, in his own right is a real partner who relates independently and by his own freedom of will with the Absolute God.[94] According to Berkovits also, in the Biblical relationship there is no trace of human freedom and creativeness. The worthless and powerlessness of man is more visible in Biblical relationship. As there is no I-Thou relationship in the Bible, man is not a partner with God in actuality of I-Thou relationship. Thus, man cannot be free in the actuality of the Biblical relationship.[95]

But according to Buber, though man is a helpless being, yet God is the one who constituted him as an independent being who is free to respond or reject God's I-Thou relationship. The true I-Thou relationship can only exist between two independent and free beings. Man is not just a tool in the hands of God. If man were a tool in the hands of God, it would not make much sense to speak of the Biblical relationship between God and man.

4.7.THE ECLIPSE OF THE ETERNAL THOU (GOD)

---

92. Martin Buber, MOSES, The Revelation and the Covenant, pp. 113-115; Cf. also, Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith, pp.51-52.

93. Martin Buber, IT, (1994), pp. 140-41; Cf. also, Streiker, The Promise of Buber ,pp. 58-59.

94. Theodor .C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1958), pp. 134-35

95. Berkovits, A Jewish Critique, pp. 58-61.

Rarest Archiver

In his work called 'Gog und Magog' in 1949, Buber uses the expression, 'The Eclipse of God'. According to him, the characteristic of the hour through which the world is passing, is the Eclipse of God and eclipse of the light of heaven. Eclipse of God is a metaphor that corresponds to the progressive degeneration of modern man and the awesome growth of IT world. The I-IT relation is gigantically swollen up or grown and it steps in between God and the creatures; and it closes off from us the light of heaven that is God. It is not only I-IT that mainly meant but the hubris or in other words arrogant pride, which oversteps all measures of life. It is not a change that takes place in humanbeings but something comes in between God and man just as in the example of the eclipse of the Sun where something occurs between the Sun and our eyes. The eclipse is not in the Sun itself but something comes in between our eyes and the Sun.[96] The Eclipse of God is a religious situation that is taking place in our time between God and man. There is a disconnection and break that takes place between God and man's religious relationship. The man of I-IT is the degenerated man, who has made himself the master of the house and driven the man of I-Thou relationship out into catacombs. The man of I-IT is the lord of the hour, who does not acknowledge neither God nor any genuine relationship. The I-IT steps in between and shuts off from us the light of heaven, and this is what has come between God and man.[97]

Hence, by the eclipse of God, it does not mean that God is absent or hidden, because He can never be absent from His

---

[96]. Martin Buber, EG,pp. 23, 129-30; Great Ideas Today,(Britannica, Great Books, 1967), p. 367; Cf. also, Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 715-17

[97]. Ibid., p. 129; Great Ideas Today, (Britannica Great Books, 1947), p. 368.

Rarest Archiver

creatures. If we have feelings that God is far from us, it is because of our lack of presence with God and others. Therefore, Buber says, "Only one Thou (God) never ceases by its nature to be Thou for us. He who knows God knows also very well remoteness from God and the anguish of barrenness in the tormented heart; but he does not know the absence of God; it is we only who are not always there. God never ceases to be Thou for us; and He is nearer to me than my I".[98]

God the Lord of human history is a self-revealing, self-hiding one. The Old Testament of the Bible speaks about the occasions when the contact between heaven and earth, God and man seems to have ceased. Man, on account of his sinfulness against God, gets lost and becomes unworthy of God and hid himself from God. Thus, man is partially responsible for the eclipse of God. From God's side also there is an incomprehensible and tremendous hiddennes; God Himself chooses such times of hiddenness and people in the Bible knew such times of the hiddeness of God. Buber presents an important reference of a person called Job who in times of adversity and sufferings clinged on to God until His distance was removed and His presence and relationship became perceivable.[99] But the question of responsibility from the part of God towards man is however unclear in Buber's system. There seems to be twofold meanings of the eclipse of God. First of all we live in a time of the eclipse of God that is happening between heaven and earth and secondly, it is not in the power of man to remove the eclipse of God.[100]

---

[98]. Martin Buber, IT,pp. 127, 104; Cf. also, Beek and Weiland, Martin Buber, pp.84-86.
Cf. also, Martin Buber, Israel and the World, pp. 30-32.
[99]. Martin Buber, EG,pp. 37, 60-61.
[100]. Ibid., pp. 23-24.

Rarest Archiver

Buber believes that when man attains his personal wholeness, certainly he can remove the eclipse of God; also all the creatures should adhere to the reality of immediate I-Thou relationship with God. But however Buber does not make the concept of the eclipse of God clearer; and many questions have remained unanswered.

4.8. THE CRITICISM OF BUBER AGAINST KIERKEGAARD'S CONCEPT OF GOD AND MAN RELATIONSHIP

Kierkegaard sees only one side of I-Thou relationship between God and man, in which the 'Single One' (man) has to stand alone before God and must separate himself or stand alone from all connections with the world of beings, creatures, in order to have intercourse and relationship with his God (Eternal Thou). In his 'Question to the Single One', Buber criticizes Kierkegaard's glorification of the singular and isolated soul who has to reject the world in order to enter into relationship with his God.[101] In Kierkegaard's teaching, through his 'Single One' this age, all history of the universe and the human race as a whole must pass.[102] In Buber's critical understanding, Kierkegaard's 'Single One' is a radical distortion of the situation of faith; and the religion is a flight of the singular or alone to alone (God).

Kierkegaard upheld his philosophy of 'Single One' to the extent of renouncing even his fiancé Regina Olsen, whom he thought was an obstacle to his solitary union with the Absolute God. Kierkegaard's most central view is that in order to come to love God one has to renounce the object of interference and can have dealings with God by standing alone. God is a single

---

101. Martin Buber, BMM,pp. 60-109.

102. Ibid., pp. 62-63; Cf. also, Soren Kierkegaard, The Point of view. Trans. Walter Loeueie, (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 130.

Rarest Archiver

one who relates the individual as a unique person and does not relate with the community of people. Hence the relationship of man is exclusive i.e., it excludes all other beings. Hence, Kierkegaard's affirmation is that as the single one, man is alone in the whole world and alone before his God.[103] Kierkegaard believes that the Single One is the truth and the crowd is untruth or falsehood, which makes the single one (man) completely irresponsible to relationship. Hence, every one should reject and cease to do anything with others and he should essentially relate only with his God in absolute solitariness.[104] Kierkegaard's society is a depraved form and it has impersonal mass of people whereas Buber's society and man is man with man in I-Thou relationship of togetherness and the 'Between'.[105] According to Buber, an individual becomes a person only in interhuman relationship; and in togetherness of community he encounters God. God-realization can take place only in and though the community of finite selves and fellowbeings's relationship; and man has to transcend the same. The creation itself is the road to relationship with God. God requires of us that we should never renounce in whatever manner any living being with which we are interwoven. We are created together and always for togetherness in the I-Thou interperpersonal relationship. God is not a rival of beings as Kierkegaard understands. Buber's own words are, "Creatures are placed in my way so that I, their fellow creature, by means of

---

103. Ibid., pp. 71,73-74; Cf. also, Rosenblueth, Martin Buber, pp. 39-41.
104. Ibid., pp. 66, 68-71; Cf. also, Garelick, The Anti Christianity of Kierkegaard, pp. 21-40; L. Smith, The Single One and Other, in the Hibbet Journal, XLVI, No. 4, (1947-49), pp. 315-1-319; Cf. also, Thomte, Kierkegaard's Philosophy of Religion, pp. 114-118; Cohen Passin, Martin Buber, pp. 37-41.
105. Ibid., pp. 264-65.

Rarest Archiver

them and with them, find the way to God. A God reached by their exclusion would not be the God of all lives in whom all life is fulfilled. A God in whom only the parallel lines of single approaches intersect is more akin to the 'God of the philosophers' than to the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. God wants us to come to him by means of the Reginas he has created and not by renouncing them.[106] Buber also teaches that God is not to be found by subtraction and not to be loved by reduction; He is to be found in the midst and detachment of the world.[107]

There cannot be I-Thou relationship with God unless there is the essential relationship with our fellow human beings and creatures.[108] When a man relates to God without relating to other, he is not fulfilled at all and when he relates to God without relating to men, he goes astray from God and others.[109]

Human life is indivisible whole and so man cannot separate his life from this world and life of God. When man fails to have an immediate relationship with fellowbeings and the world, he cannot love the God of the universe.[110] Kierkegaard's concept of the Single One's love and relationship is like throwing man's loving relationship into void.[111] In Buber's understanding, I become I through my relation to the Thou and as I become I, I say Thou. All real living is meeting; and in the I-Thou relationship the Single one emerges and through the

---

106. Ibid., pp. 73-74; Cf. also, Wheelwright, Buber's Philosophical Anthropology, in Schilpp, PMB, pp, 77-80; Cf. also, Jacob Trapp, To Hallow the life, An Anthology, ed. With intro. J. Trapp, (New York: Harper, 1958), pp. xii-xiv.
107. Ibid., pp. 80-81; Cf. also, Schaeder, Martin Buber, pp. 178-180; Cf. also, Martin Buber, IT,p. 104; Martin
108. Martin Buber, Hasidism, pp. 165-66.
109. Martin Buber, BMM,pp. 33-34.
110. Martin Buber, Hasidism, pp. 167-171.
111. Martin Buber, BMM, pp. 88-89.

Rarest Archiver

MYSORE

Thou a man becomes a I. One cannot be answerable without being at the same time answerable for the other as he is entrusted; the I and the other (Thou) are interwoven interpersonal relationship.[112]

Everything should gather up and exist only in the Absolute relationship with God and others. The reality of the single one includes and encompasses the Absolute I-Thou relationship with God and all others.[113] The fundamental relationship should be triadic, i.e., the single one (I) God and other (Thous); and the real relationship to God cannot be achieved in the absence of true and real relationship to the world and humanbeings.[114]

But Leslie Zeigler seems to correct Buber's misunderstanding of Kierkegaard and maintains that it is only through the love of God man comes to know the real meaning of love. Every form of love, which is not founded in God, may be the middle term or the missing link and God is the middle term in the love of one's neighbour; and when one loves his God above all else, then he also loves his neighbour.[115] God must be the middle term in order that the relationship God and man should be real relationships.[116] Jean Wahl opines regarding

---

112. Martin Buber, IT, p.44; Martin Buber, BMM, pp. 63-64; Cf. also, Ronald Gregor Smith, The Thoughts of Martin Buber, Burning Glass paper, No. 18, (Shorne Kent: Ridgeway House, 1947, pp, 14-15

113. Ibid., p. 103; Cf. also, Constance I. Smith, The Single One and the Other, in Hibbert Journal XLVI, No. 4, (1947-48), pp. 315-18.

114. Ibid., p.128; Cf. also, Will Herberg, Martin Buber, Philosophers of Religious Existence in the writings of Martin Buber, ed. Will Herberg, pp. 15-18.

115. Kierkegaard, Works of love. Trans. David Swenson and Lillian M. Swenson, Princeton, (N.J. Princeton University Press, 1949), pp. 37, 48-49, 87-89.

116. Leslie Zeigler, Personal Existence, A Study of Buber and Kierkegaard, in Journal of Religion, 40, (April. 1960), pp.93-95.

Rarest Archiver

Kierkegaard that the latter does not maintain that one must reject or dispense with trust in the other in order to have relationship with the Absolute.[117] Though Buber seems to be rather one-sided in his interpretation of Kierkegaard's conception of the Single one, yet, in truth Buber holds that nobody can refute Kierkegaard's conception of the single one more forcefully except Kierkegaard himself.[118]

4.3 . THE RELATIONSHIP OF 'I' TO 'THOU' AND 'THOU' TO 'I' (THE I-THOU RELATIONSHIP)

Buber describes the concepts of 'I' and 'Thou' only in connection to each other as I and Thou. The 'I' and 'Thou' signify personal relationships and manifest their interwoven bond between two persons in intimate relationship. To be is to be related and everything in the world is being with others in relationship. 'To be' means to be the being that is over-against.[119] When one speaks the primary word the I-Thou with his whole being and meaning, he really enters into I-Thou relationship and his 'inborn Thou' is realized; and in which there is no internal conflict and contradiction. Buber's own words are, "IN THE beginning is relation. RELATION IS mutual; my Thou affects me as I affect it".[120]

The I and Thou relationship is both a central act and extensive at the same time. Buber summarizes the I-Thou relationship as, 'the life from one's being' which indicates the fundamental reality that is implied in such a

---

117. Jean Wahl, Buber and Philosophies of Existence, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 485-86.
118. Martin Buber, BMM, p. 79.
119. Martin Buber, Anthropological Fragments, in Schilpp, PMB, p. 35-36.
120. Martin Buber, Philosophical Interrogations, pp. 52-54, 82-83; Martin Buber, IT,pp. 30-32.

Rarest Archiver

relationship.[121] The I-Thou relationship is not an arbitrary interaction between two persons but an intimate bond between the two; and we cannot define but describe such relationship. In it there is no subject-object attitude and when such type of attitude is ceased the other becomes a Thou to the I. The I stands with 'other' in mutual and genuine relationship. In the I-Thou relationship, the I takes the other in all seriousness and the I respects the other through the simple forms of greeting, showing sympathy, trusting the other in love and comradship.[122] The I-Thou relationship is for all times for all people,[123] and anybody can practice it; and in it there is radical responsibility, decision-making, direction of life and creating trust among persons.

In the subjective movement of freedom and supra-subjective moment of grace from above are necessary for the I-Thou relationship. Buber says," It is grace for which one must always be ready and which one never gains as an assured possession",[124] and the 'Thou' meets me by grace... it is not found by seeking".[125]

The unique characteristic of I-Thou relationship is immediacy and the mediacy is expelled all together. As the humanbeing is the center of surprise, the I-Thou relationship takes place in such surprise; and such relationship touches the core of one's being. Though such relationship does not last long, it bears the mark of a mystery.[126]

---

121. Martin Buber, KM,pp. 75-77.
122. Romano Guardini, The World and the Person, Trans. Stella Lange, (Chicago: H. Regency, 1965),pp 129-31
123. Martin Buber, BMM,pp. 54-56.
124. Martin Buber, IT, p. 164.
125. Ibid., p. 24.
126. Ibid., pp. 30-31, 57.

Rarest Archiver

The wholeness of the I stands over against the wholeness of the Thou in I-Thou relationship. Buber maintains that it is only through the uncanny primary word of I-Thou or a man besides other man who lives over against the I, man's existence is fulfilled.[127]

Time, space can also play a special role in I-Thou relationship and the physical time is taken away in the presence of I and Thou relationship.[128] The spirit is that something that happens without being expected from the other; and it is something that happens between I and Thou which is the response of one to another in relationship. Buber says, "Man lives in the spirit when he is able to respond to his Thou. He is able to, if he enters into relationship with his whole being. Only in virtue of his power to enter into relation is he able to live in spirit.[129] And when the spirit enters into man's being, it enables him to live over against the other in relationship and it empowers man to be a special relational sphere of person.[130] As the spirit is ordained to the sphere of the 'between' (interhuman) and the personal experience, love and relationship are realized between man and man. The spirit exists between man and man, man and nature and between God and man who enters into relationship. The I and Thou participate in the spirit while they face each other in the intimate I-Thou relationship.

4.10. THE I AND THOU RELATIONSHIP IN THREE SPHERES

The I-Thou relationship unfolds itself in three spheres wherein the human nature is fundamentally built up. First, our life with nature in which the relation sways in gloom beneath

---

127. Ibid., p. 51.
128. Ibid., p. 47.
129. Ibid., p. 58.
130. Martin Buber, Autobiographical Fragments, in Schilpp, PMB, pp.36-37.

Rarest Archiver

the level of speech. Creatures live and move over against us but cannot come to us. And when we address them as Thou, our words cling to the threshold of speech. Second, our life with men: here, the relation is open in the form of speech and we can give and accept the Thou (Other). Third, our life with spiritual beings: here, the relation is clouded, yet it discloses itself; it does not use speech but begets it. Here at this level we perceive no Thou but nonetheless we feel that we are addressed and we answer—forming, thinking, and acting. We speak the primary word with our being though we cannot utter Thou with our lips.[131] Hence, the summary of the three spheres are: - our life with nature, in which the relation clings to the threshold of speech; our life with men, in which the relation takes on the form of speech; and our life with the spiritual beings, where the relation is without speech yet begets it.[132]

It is all-possible for us to enter into personal relationship with all things. The living would mean, being related; and we need to present ourselves and perceive in relationship.[133] Though, creatures like plants, animals lakes etc. stir across from us and in a sense of eloquent muteness they speak to us, at times they cannot come to us.[134] Like the other humanbeings, creatures and things in nature cannot become partners in a fully reciprocal relationship. The nature to a certain extent can be considered in the I-Thou relatioship.[135] Buber gives his personal experience of I-Thou with nature especially of the Tatra Mountain and the deep lake. The dark-covered landscape below the mountain and the lake no longer was

---

131. Martin Buber, IT, p. 19.
132. Ibid., p. 130; Cf. also, Martin Buber, KM, pp.64-65.
133. Martin Buber, BMM, pp. 27-29.
134. Martin Buber, IT, p.18.
135. Ibid., pp. 124-126.

Rarest Archiver

stranger to him but it was an intimate, personal element to him.[136]

Even a tree can become a Thou to the I because the relationship is immediate and mutual. We can encounter no soul or dryad of the tree but the tree itself.[137] A poet or an artist can also react to Sunset or to a flower as a whole in living actuality of relationship.[138] Even we can have a living relationship with many animals and creatures like, a horse, house cat etc.[139]

Buber further opines that our relationship or our life with the creations of the spirit for example, art, poetry, sculpture, etc, are the creative work of an artist and therefore they are the 'spirit' become word and spirit become form. A form of a tree or an object confronts an artist and seems to request him to turn it to a work of an art. But in general we feel ourselves that we are called to answer and related with it (a tree or a flower) with our whole being.[140] Paton opines that a painter responds in colours, the musician in notes regarding their particular object of relationship. Hence, in this wide sense of understanding of language or speech, the forms of the spirit are embodied in the philosophical systems of thinkers and the works of art.[141]

But, according to Buber, the life of man with man is the sphere par excellence in which the personal relationship

---

136. Martin Buber, Daniel, pp. 37-39; Cf. also, Pfuetze, The Social Self, pp.133-34.
137. Martin Buber, IT, pp. 19-21.
138. Martin Buber, BMM, p. 57.
139. Martin Buber, IT, pp. 124-125; Cf. also, Martin Buber, Autobiographical Fragments, in Schilpp, PMB, pp.10-11; Cf. also, Martin Buber, BMM, pp. 41-43.
140. Ibid., p. 162; Cf. also, Maurice Friedman, Introductory Essay , in Buber, K.M, (1965), pp . 52,-54-55; Cf. also, Schaeder, Martin Buber, pp.119-120.
141. Paton, The Modern Predicament, pp.163-64.

Rarest Archiver

unfolds fully. The other two (relations with the nature and spiritual beings) are considered to be the side portals in relationship. In the I-Thou relationship of man with man alone, the true personal being of man emerges; and our living relationship takes the form of relational speech which is finalized in the give and take relation to each other.

In the first two spheres, though, plants, animals and artistic creations do in a sense speak to us, yet they cannot become partners for us,[142] in a fully reciprocal relational encounter as our fellow humanbeings do. Only in the personal relationships, there is love which does not cling to the I in such a way as to have the Thou only for its content or as object but love is between I and Thou and Love is responsibility of an I of a Thou.[143]

Goethe and Hoderlin made a lasting influence on Buber for his thought and motto; and particularly Goethe's important verse, "So waiting I have won from thee the end God's presence in each element" made a lasting impression on Buber's philosophy.[144] As regards God the Eternal Thou, Buber says, "In every sphere in its own way, through each process of becoming that is present to us, we look out toward the fringe of the Eternal Thou; in each we are aware a breath from the Eternal Thou. Every sphere is compassed in the Eternal Thou - but it is not compassed in them. In each Thou we address the Eternal Thou.[145]

Hence, all these sphere of relationships prepare the way for the relationship to the Eternal Thou, the Absolute,

---

142. Martin Buber, IT,p.18.
143. Ibid., pp,. 28-29.
144. Maurice Friedman, Op. Cit.,p.19; Cf. also, Martin Buber, IT,p. vii.
145. Martin Buber, IT, pp. 130,19.

Rarest Archiver

although we may say Thou to a definite object of our relationship.

4.11. THE I AND THOU RELATIONSHIP AND ITS STRUCTURE-DISTANCE AND RELATIONSHIP

The life of man when it is properly directed may swing between the I-Thou and I-IT world of relationship. The concept of man is not simple but twofold which represent two complementary movements of the mind of him, i.e., the I-Thou and I-IT, in such categories man can enter into relationship, and both I-Thou and I-IT together form the necessary basis of relationship.[146] The I-Thou and I-IT are the first and fundamental contributions of Buber to philosophy of Anthropology of I-Thou.[147]

The foundation or basis of the principles of I-Thou and I-IT is the 'Distance' which, as an attitude makes man a person; the 'distance' distinguishes man from animals or creatures. The 'distance' is presumption of the primary act of man to enter into relationship with other. One can enter into relationship only with the being that has been set at a distance which has more precisely become an independent opposite being. So, Buber affirms that only an independent opposite exists for man. What is peculiar to man is that man becomes aware again and always that of the other who exists over against him and in return man himself exists over against the other.[148]

Man, in order to make the world and other humanbeings to stand over against him, has the basic capacity to set the world

---

146. Martin Buber, KM,pp. 60-61; Cf. also, Paul Tournier, The meaning of Persons, (New York: Harper &Row, 1957, pp. 125-128; Cf. also, Wheel Wright, Buber's Philosophical Anthropology, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 82-85.

147. Schaeder, Martin Buber, pp. 363-64.

148. Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 694-96; Martin Buber, Autobiographical Fragments, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 35-37; Martin Buber, KM,pp. 60-61.

Rarest Archiver

and other fellowmen at a distance; and the otherness of the other is found only in 'distance'.[149]

There can be an entering into relationship only if there is already an independent other who stands in relationship. Thus there is the complementarity and mutuality within the movements of distance and relationship that are most evident and necessary in man's life with his fellowbeing. One becomes a Thou to the I only when the other is made independent through the act of distancing him. In the twofold movement of distance and relationship, the world that is set at a distance becomes a real world for a person. Man has the unique ability to set things and fellowbeing at a distance through which he grasps them in their completeness and wholeness as distinct or separate from him; and in their independent existence, man understands them in their over-againsness to himself.[150] because of double stance of distance and relationship which is unique in human language and because of this man alone can address the other as other who stands in relationship to the I.

Only man is able to transcend the world and penetrate into the dimensions of space and time. Man unifies and objectifies the world and through him the world exists as something different from him. Hence, it is man who has a world in the sense that it stands over against him.[151] Animals are unable to distance the world that stands over against it, but man alone can enter into relationship with the world over against him in relationship.[152]

---

149. Martin Buber, KM, pp. 61, 64-65, 67; Cf. also, Rotenstreich, The Right and Limitations of Buber's Dialogical Thought, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 110-113.
150. Ibid., pp. 71, 67, 78-80. 117-119.
151. Ibid., pp.61-62; Cf. also, Schaeder, Martin Buber, pp. 364-67.
152. Ibid., pp. 59-63.

Rarest Archiver

The distance and relationship permeate and sustain each other. The relationship is made possible by the appearance of the first act, i.e., the distance. Man can set at a distance instead of coming into real relationship with whatever he has set at a distance. Only when relationship fails to follow, then the distance is solidified into I-IT or it remains single or separated - this is also called as 'objectification' of the wholeness or completeness over against the other. The 'distance' corresponds to I-IT and relationship corresponds to I-Thou. When a humanbeing fails to enter into relationship, the distance becomes thickened and solidified; and such act obstructs the primary act of entering into relationship with the others and this failure to enter into relationship refers to the world of I-IT. There is the incurable temptation of man to further and accentuate the distance and take his refuge in the false security of the ordered objectivity of the world. The I-Thou movement signifies the relationship with others.[153]

4.12. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF I AND THOU RELATIONSHIP

The characteristics that are elucidated here below are the constituents of the structure of I-thou relationship. The absence of any of these will mean the absence of relationship. Few and important characteristics of I-Thou relationships are given here below.

4.12.1. ACCEPTING AND CONFIRMING THE OTHERNESS (THOU)

To pass from distance to relationship, both mutual confirmation and acceptance are necessary. The acceptance of the otherness of the other (Thou) is the first decisive phenomenon of the I-Thou relationship. So, the genuine relationship or every actual fulfillment of relationship

---

[153]. Ibid., pp. 63-65; Cf. also, Martin Buber, Philosophical Interrogations, Pp. 27-28; Cf . also, Maurice Friedman, Martin Buber, pp.82-85.

Rarest Archiver

between man and man mean acceptance of the otherness of the other.[154] When the I accepts the other (Thou), the other is really accepted in his peculiar being; and the I confirms, accepts him in his existence and otherness. The other (Thou) is accepted in reality and concreteness or in his elemental otherness which is the living fact of the otherness of him.[155] The I receives the other as his partner and confirms his being.[156]

The I-Thou is ontological in character therefore I does not have other choice than to accept and confirm the other. Even one's own enemy is accepted and confirmed here. The choice of accepting and confirming belongs to the sphere of Eros because at this level, it is out of one's inclination, one chooses the other (Thou).[157]

The man of I-Thou relationship does not choose his partner and instead, he accepts anybody who stands over against him and deliberately without any choice he meets the other.

The I can be in a disagreement with the other on an individual matter but, it is by accepting the other (Thou) as one's partner in genuine relationship besides all his peculiarities, one affirms the other as his fellowman.[158] And further, there is an innate demand and desire in man for acceptance and confirmation of the other (Thou); and every man

---

154. Ibid., pp. 69-70.
155. Martin Buber, BMM, pp.84-85; Cf. also, Martin Buber, KM, pp. 69,78-79, 181-83.
156. Martin Buber, KM, pp.85-86, Cf. also, Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp.723-24
157. Martin Buber, BMM, p.121.
158. Martin Buber, KM,79-81; Martin Buber, BMM,pp, 207,216-17; Cf. also, Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 423-24.

Rarest Archiver

wishes and desires to be confirmed as what he is and what he will become later.[159]

Man has an innate urge to be confirmed in his essence and existence by his fellow beings, because he needs it. The acceptance and confirmation of the other is not psychological factor but an urge in the human nature which is the key to his existential actualization. Hence, the act of acceptance and confirmation belongs to the very structure and actualization of real human existence of I-Thou relationship.[160]

A society in fact can be termed human only according to the measure in which mutual confirmation takes place among men. So, without such complementing and mutual confirmation, a pluralistic form cannot be thought of. The confirmation corresponds to the basic fact of man's existence of man with another man.[161]

4.12.2. THE MUTUALITY OR RECIPROCITY OF RELATIONSHIP

The essence of I-Thou relationship is reciprocity or mutuality; and I-Thou is conditioned bipolarly. Buber's own words are, "RELATIONSHIP IS mutual (reciprocity). My Thou acts on me, as I affect it".[162] Only in the mutual or reciprocal saying of Thou, relationship comes into being and I and Thou become co-partners. The mutuality is the mutual participation of both the partners in each other's existence. The mutual

---

159. Martin Buber, KM,pp. 67-69; Cf. also, Nahun N. Glatzer. Ed. The Way of Response, of Martin Buber: Selections from His Writings, (New York: Schocken Books, 1966), pp. 207-208;
160. Ibid., pp. 67-72.
161. Ibid., pp. 78,85-86. Cf. also, Maurice Friedman, Martin Buber, pp. 81-82; Cf. also, Martin Buber, BMM, pp. 84, 49-50.
162. Martin Buber, IT, pp. 165,30.

Rarest Archiver

conditioned nature of relationship is bipolar and not one sided; and I-IT is unilateral.[163]

Though there are some I-Thou relationships that in their nature may not unfold to full mutuality, the relationships to be perfect are to be only endowed with complete mutuality with one another. Thus only when complete mutuality stirs, the interhuman springs into genuine I-Thou relationship.[164]

The fundamental quality of both partners is mutuality and no partner takes position of precedence over the other because the very essence of I-Thou relationship is equality between the I and Thou. Every person is of unique value and in and through encountering with his other (Thou) one's own existence is authenticated and fulfilled.[165] The Thou becomes a self with the I in mutuality and the self is fulfilled in and through the I-Thou relationship. Buber holds that the self-being is the heavenly bread and humanbeings pass it from one to another in mutual-reciprocal I-Thou relationship.[166]

Buber writes, "The I affects the Thou and Thou affects I; and the I and the Thou act upon each other.[167] Further, Buber held that in the I-Thou relationship, the reality of love does not invalidate the I or rather it binds the I to the other (Thou)more closely.[168] Hence, one can receive love and knowledge only in mutuality. According to Scholastics, though knowledge is real, yet, it is not mutual relationship between the partners.

---

163. Ibid., p. 166.
164. Ibid., p. 164; Cf. also, Martin Buber, KM,pp. 81-82.
165. Maurice Friedman, The Basis of Buber's Ethics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 191-92.
166. Martin Buber, KM,pp. 71-72.
167. Martin Buber, IT,pp. 37,24.
168. Martin Buber, On Judaism, ed. Nahum, N. Glatzer, (New York: Schocken Books, 1967), pp. 210-211.

Rarest Archiver

The nature of anthropological life of I and Thou are conditioned with each other in mutuality alone. However, Buber acknowledges that full mutuality is not inherent in men's life together.[169]

As regards the I-Thou relationship in thee spheres such as, our life with nature, with men and with spiritual beings,[170] Buber maintains that in the case of nature we discover such a mutuality of being itself, i.e., a mutuality that has nothing except being itself. The being of nature has intercommunion with being of I; and the sense world arises because of the relational communion of the being of the I with its being itself.[171] The mutuality of being in the relational meeting within the nature is said to be the pre-threshold of true response or address. Buber also maintains that the relationship in the sphere of nature clings to the threshold of speech; and distinguishes between threshold and the pre-threshold of mutuality, between the non-living and the living nature. He teaches that man has his real contact in real mutuality with this world in all its aspects in which the world meets him.[172]

4.12.3.THE OPENING UP AND MAKING PRESENT OF EVERYTHING

It is in the event of making present of everything, the mutual confirmation of I and Thou reaches its heights and its relational principle realized fully.[173] In the relationship between the I and Thou or in their mutuality of making present of each other's self to one another and through knowledge,

---

169. Martin Buber, IT,p. 164.
170. Ibid., pp. 18-19, 130.
171. Martin Buber, KM,pp. 158-59.
172. Martin Buber, IT,pp. 162-63, 18; Cf. also, Martin Buber, KM,pp. 184-85.
173. Ibid., pp. 70-71.

Rarest Archiver

confirmation, affirmation and acceptance of each other the real I-Thou relationship takes place.[174]

Making present or opening up consists in accepting the other as one's partner and in confirming him as a person. ther is an unreserved readiness opening of oneself to the other without reservation. The making present is reciprocal or give and take between both partners.

Reaching out to the other, outgoing to the other and companying with the other through his life of relationship, are the three phases that go before, in the true I and Thou relatioship.[175]

Making present rises above the concepts like insight and intuition that only correspond to the realm of knowledge or distance to the two partners; and it refers to intimate personal relationship by the I who touches the very core of the being of his Thou (other).

Making present rises above the concepts like insight and intuition that only corresponds to the realm of knowledge or distance of the two partners; and it refers to intimate personal relationship by the I who touches the very core of the being of his Thou (other). Making present would also mean not to investigate the other (Thou) but courageously and intensively stirring one's own being (I) to enter into other's life. There is wholeness of life in the other through making present.[176]

Only when the other becomes present to the I such a awareness of the wholeness of the other can take place, and only when the other (Thou) becomes present to the I, the

---

[174]. Martin Buber, KM, pp. 71-72; Cf. also, Marcel L'Anthroplogie Philosophieque de Martin Buber, in Martin Buber: L' Homme et le Philosophe, pp. 27-28.
[175]. Martin Buber, BMM, pp. 39-40.
[176]. Martin Buber, KM, pp. 80-82.

Rarest Archiver

presence of the other come into existence or being. Thus, Buber says, "The present arises only in virtue of the fact that the Thou becomes present".[177] In the making present, the other (Thou) becomes present to the I in the innermost depths of his substantial being wherein the I experiences the other's mystery of being in his own mystery of being; and in the I-Thou relationship there is the awareness of the personal making present.[178]

When we mean the partner (Thou), it is to exercise that level or degree of making present or opening up which is in his capacity. The whole person's activity as he is made present in the process of making present.[179] In the act of making present, the other becomes a self with the I because of his indispensable presumption of Independence.

It is through meeting and through the existential relationship between two partners who are in actual being and in the process of becoming, the opening up takes place. Though the human reality is a mystery, there cannot be any prejudices and pre-calculations in such a type of opening up one to anther.[180] Only when the I accepts the otherness of the Thou, then the Thou can live and face the I in the complete comprehension of I-Thou existence; and in such a relationship alone, the other brings the radiance light of the eternity to the I.[181]

4.12.4. THE RELATIONSHIP OF ACTUALTIY AND LATENCY

The actuality and latency as the double concepts help us to understand the inner nature of the I-Thou relationship more

---

177. Martin Buber, IT, p. 26.
178. Martin Buber, BMM,pp, 207-208; Cf. also, Martin Buber, KM,pp. 80-81.
179. Martin Buber, KM,pp. 84-86.
180. Martin Buber, KM, pp. 71, 82-83.
181. Martin Buber, BMM, pp. 49-51.

Rarest Archiver

clearly. Though the duration of I-Thou relationship is short, yet the relationship does not cease completely. So, Buber writes, "It is not the relation that necessarily grows feeble, but the actuality of its immediacy. Hence the relationship itself continues in latency and attains actuality one again. It can be illustrated through the example of love which does not always remain in the relationship. Buber writes, "Love itself cannot persist in the immediacy of relation; love endures, but in the interchange of actual and potential being;[182] or in other words, love cannot remain in the actuality and latency alternation. The relation never breaks away. We cannot identify the actuality and latency with Thou and IT world. Though the I-IT is only a relationship of experience, the I-Thou relationship continues in latency. In the realm of I and Thou relationship, every differentiated and graded degree of realization are possible.[183]

4.12.5. THE RELATIONSHIP OF IMMEDIACY AND CONCRETENESS

The I and Thou come closer to each other by the character of immediacy. The concept of immediacy means that the partners in I-Thou relationship directly turn to each other without mediacy or a mediator. Thus Buber says, "The Thou meets me, but I enter into direct (immediate) relation with it. THE RELATION to the Thou is direct. The Thou confronts me. But I step into direct relation with it; and the Thou is the actuality of its immediacy.[184]

There is no mediation of person or a thing of use purpose have place in I-Thou relationship; and nothing conceptual like prior knowledge or imagination or anything intervenes between

---

[182]. Martin Buber, IT,pp. 127.

[183]. Martin Buber, BMM, pp. 56-58; Cf. also, Martin Buber, Philosophical Interrogations, pp. 79-80.
Martin Buber,, IT, pp.24-25, 101, 127.

Rarest Archiver

the I and Thou. As the other exists in the present and means or instrumentality can be an obstacle to the I-Thou relationship.[185] There is no hindrance, calculation or mistrust between I and Thou and the I looks at the other impartially and spontaneously. Buber called the moment of immediacy or directness as looking into the heart of one another's eyes; and such a concept of Buber sprang from his own personal experience of friendship.[186]

The immediacy or directness in a truer sense is the shortest distance between the two partners who stand face to face each other who relate to each other in an unreserved overagainstness. The specific quality of immediacy or directness is a truth or authenticity in which both the partners relate to each other in their pure essence of being. Everything depends on the legitimacy of what I has to relate to the other.[187]

In Buber's concrete understanding, only the renewal of relational immediacy in every field of man will make his life really worth living and only it gives the hope of this hour to overcome the non-trust that has taken roots everywhere in every field of life.[188]

The quality of concreteness lies in the immediate I-Thou relationship of the partners. The relationship is between two concrete person, between I and Thou and not between two thinking machines. Buber, often referred to 'concreteness' in his writings. Man as an existential being exists with the other (other) in immediacy and concreteness.

4.12.6.THE EXCLUSIVENESS OF RELATIONSHIP

---

185. Ibid., p.24.
186. Martin Buber, BMM,pp. 21-23.
187. Martin Buber, KM,pp. 77,86-87.
188. Martin Buber, Pointing the Way, pp. 20-30.

Rarest Archiver

The exclusiveness follows immediacy or directness which is essential to I-Thou relationship. Out of many humanbeings capable of relationship, a definite humanbeing here in exclusiveness enters into relationship and becomes the other (Thou) to an I and the rest become unimportant. The other (Thou) stands undivided in the presence of the I. The total and unlimited presentness is the exclusiveness of I-Thou.

The other (Thou) in relationship is not more a Thou beside other Thous' but he becomes a Thou who cannot be replaced or exchanged; and this concept is called exclusiveness or set apart. In the exclusiveness there are no irrelevancies, divisions or abstractions. Buber says," Every real relation with a being or life in the world is exclusive. Its Thou is freed, steps forth, is single and confronts you. It fills the heavens This does not mean that nothing else exists; but all else lives in its light.[189]

Reciprocity and intensity exists between two partners who exclusively relate with each other. The exclusive character of relationship limits only to two persons at a time and it does not admit an extension of the bond of relationship to more than two persons.[190] Hence, Ebner also maintains that there is no plurality between the I and the Thou relationship.[191]

The human nature of speech corresponds to the exclusiveness of I-Thou relationship. In a real sense, only between two exclusive persons, the mutual relationship takes place. There is the mystical element in Buber's exclusive concept of relationship.[192]

4.12.7. THE ENCOMAPSSING OR INCLUSION OF EVERYTHING

---

189. Martin Buber, IT,pp. 130, 21, 27.
190. Tournier, The Meaning of Persons, pp.145-46.
191. Ebner, Work and Life, pp. 287-88.
192. Martin Buber, BMM,pp. 26-28.

Rarest Archiver

Whatever that culminates is mutuality (reciprocity) in inclusion (encompassing). It is from the concept of inclusion that all relationships are authenticated.[193] Inclusion or encompassing is bipolar experience that apprehends the relationship from both sides of I and Thou. When two person experience and event in common or one partner does not grab of confiscate anything of the experienced reality of the other partner, it is inclusion or encompassing. The I experiences the Thou which is determined by the element of encompassing in the I-Thou relationship. The fulfillment of the lived situation in the presence of the participated actuality of both partners is the essence of inclusion. In the inclusion, the I stands in relation with the other at the same time very intensely touches the being of the Thou.

When the I experiences the other (Thou), it would mean that the I feels an event from other person's side who confronts him or makes the other's event as one's own. In other words, it is living or experiencing through what the other is living or experiencing through. To this, Buber gives an example of a boy who caresses a girl who in turn lets herself caressed by him. The boy feels the contact from two sides, i.e., with his palm as well as with the skin of the girl.[194] This is called the inclusion or encompassing, which is the bipolar experience of both the partners. We cannot identify the inclusion or encompassing with the empathy because it tends to stop the independent position of the I and Thou who meet each other in I-Thou situational relationship. Thus, the inclusion or encompassing is the extension of one's own concreteness, wherein that actual life situation is fulfilled and the I-Thou

---

193. Martin Buber, BMM,pp. 125-26; Cf. also, Sevilla, God as Person, pp. 52-54.
194. Ibid., pp. 121-22.

Rarest Archiver

experience mutual or reciprocal relationship with each other. The inclusion includes three aspects such as, the relationship between two persons, the two partners experiencing an event in common by active participation and the I lives through the common event of relationship from the stand point of Thou.[195]

In inclusion, the relationship is to actually participate in the life or the very being of the other.[196] Within the dimension of I-Thou, the inclusion only can break through into the being of the other partner.

There are three forms or degrees of encompassing.[197] The partners in I-Thou relationship abstain from fully actualizing each other; and they relate one another as spiritual persons in relationship. From the fullness of the actuality of both the partners, for example, two persons in debate become aware of each other's genìusness and the second and the third forms emerge. The second type is based on a concrete but one sided experience of the partners, such as, in the example of a patient and psychiatrist. Here the mutuality or reciprocity cannot be achieved.[198]

The third form is the friendship that is the most perfect degree of I-Thou relationship, which is based on a concrete and mutual experience of inclusion. In friendship there is the true inclusion of one another by the souls of human persons.[199] The I and Thou realize each other in their depth and are present to each other most intimately and perfectly.

---

[195]. Ibid., pp. 124-26.
[196]. Ibid., pp. 124-25. Cf. also, Pfuetze, The Social Self, pp.176-78.
[197]. Ibid., pp. 128-29.
[198]. Martin Buber, IT, pp. 165-67.
[199]. Martin Buber, BMM,pp. 128-29.

Rarest Archiver

CHAPTER–5
THE 'IT'

5.0.THE INTRODUCTION

Buber writes, "The attitude of man is twofold, in accordance with the twofold nature of the primary words which he speaks. The primary words are not isolated words, but combined words. The one primary word is the combination of I-THOU and the other primary word is the combination I-IT; wherein, without a change in the primary word, one of the words He and She can replace IT. Hence the I of man is also twofold. PRIMARY WORDS do not signify things, but they intimate relations. Primary words are spoken from the being. If Thou is said, the, I of the combination I-THOU is said along with it. If IT is said, the I of the combination I-IT is said along with it. The primary word I-IT can never be spoken with the whole being. For, the I of the primary word I-THOU is a different I from that of the primary word of I-IT".[1]

In the I and Thou relational philosophy of Buber, one of the fundamental principles is, "THERE IS no I taken in itself, but only the I of the primary word I -Thou and the I of the primary word I-It.[2] The I of man refers to I of I-IT and the I of I-Thou and so the I of man is also twofold. The I of the I-IT relationship is essentially different from that of the I-Thou relational world; and the I in I-Thou and I-IT relations have radically different connotations.[3] The I of the primary world I-IT is said to be an object of experience, which always relates itself to an IT in the world of experience. Thus Buber

---

1. Martin Buber, I and Thou, Trans. Ronald Gregor Smith, (T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1994), pp. 15-16, 48,85. Hereafter it is cited as IT
2. Ibid. p. 16.
3. Ibid., pp. 15-16; Cf. also, Woods, Martin Buber's Ontology, pp.38-39.

Rarest Archiver

says, "For where there is a thing there is another thing. Every IT is bounded by others; IT exists only through being bounded by others. The I of the I-IT can be spoken only where and when other beings out side are observed and treated as mere objects of utility, observation and reflection. Therefore when the I say, IT' the I takes the other in relation as his object. So, Buber mentions of twofold I.[3]

But Anzenbacher had raised an objection to Buber and maintained that there is no any evidence for these two types of I's that may correspond to our daily human experience.[4] To his objection Buber clarified of what he meant by his dual I. He holds that if we maintain that out of the I-Thou relation another I emerges than out of the I-IT relationship, it means that here a different I actualizes itself; and further it is correct to hold that through I's own awareness there takes place his self-realization.[5]

According to Buber, I of the primary word I-IT is the monological I of scientific world; and the man who says I-IT, stands before things, but not over against them in the flow of mutual action.[6] Buber's own words are, "AS EXPERIENCE, the world belongs to the primary word of I-IT".[7] The I of the primary word I-IT, that is, the I faced by no Thou, but surrounded by a multitude of contents, has no present, only the past. So the IT is the eternal chrysalis.[8] The I of the I-IT comes to appear as individuality. Thus, Buber writes, "Individuality becomes conscious of itself a being such-and -such and nothing else.

---

3. Ibid., pp. 15-17.
4. Anzenbacher, The Philosophy of Martin Buber, pp. 101-102.
5. Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 695-96.
6. Martin Buber, IT,p. 46; Cf. also, Maringer, Martin Buber's Metaphysics, pp. 38-39.
7. Ibid., p. 18.
8. Ibid., pp. 26, 32.

Rarest Archiver

Individuality in differentiating itself from others is rendered remote from true being. The person looks on his self, individuality is concerned with its My-my kind, my race, my creation, my genius. Paschal had termed it as 'Moi', which turns around itself, and as subjectivity it is conscious of itself.[9] Further, Buber teaches that the I of the I-IT world stops with itself and wallows in its being that way and closes its doors against the other partner in relationship; and Buber calls this type of I-IT world as the bending or turning back on oneself in relationship.[10] in the shared reality, the I of the I-IT as individuality fails to share in reality of the other partner.

As the I-Thou relationship is the authentic relationship, the I-IT is the inauthentic relationship; and John Macmurray calls these attitudes as the personal and the impersonal ones. The doctrine of twofold nature of human attitudes are realizing and an orienting attitudes in Buber's system. The I-IT is an attitude of Orientation and objectification or it is of monologues and objectifying attitude.

In Buber' opinion, in the present world, the I-IT is more frequent and powerful that the I-Thou; and no moment of human life however is purely I-Thou or I-IT. These two attitudes are inextricably interwoven with each other. It is through the 'between', that we come to know of what determines and which of these attitudes is present at any given moment. According to Buber, only man can address a Thou or IT that stands over against him in his relationship.

---

9. Ibid., pp. 86-88; Cf. also, C. Sevilla, God as Person, in the Writings of Martin Buber, Logos No. 4 (Manila: Loyola House of Studies, Ateneo de Manila University, 1970), pp. 43-44, 49-50.

10. Martin Buber, Between Man and Man, Trans.Ronald Gegor Smith, (1961), pp. 41-42. Hereafter it is cited as BMM.

Rarest Archiver

Buber holds that when a man speaks IT, then the distance to the over against of the other remains unabridged. Therefore consequently, one who speaks IT, is not certainly in a position to speak the IT with his whole being. Hence, Buber says, "The primary word I-IT can never be spoken with the whole being".[11] He means to say here that the word of IT cannot be spoken with one's whole being, be it to another person, to work of art or to God (the Eternal Thou). Buber mentions that the I-Thou and I-IT attitudes represent two quite different worlds although there is no clear-cut division between the two worlds. According to him they are two world aspects rather than two worlds of I-Thou and I-IT. And so, in Buber's concrete understanding, there is one world, which is twofold; and this twofold character runs through the whole world, through each person and each human activity of life.

5.1.THE WORLF OF I AND IT

In almost all his treatise Buber treats the I-IT relationship in a deduced form, only as a help to understand the I-Thou relationship. As it is pointed out in earlier sections, the I-IT world is of separation, detachment of subject and object, utilization, orientation, individuality. In the I-IT relationship, the subject (I) manipulates, exploits or uses the other (Thou) for some end beyond the other.[12] The primary word of I-IT is to use and experience the other.[13] It is entirely subjective (not really subjective) and it lacks in reciprocity.[14] The I-IT is always mediate and indirect in knowing, feeling or acting with the other in relationship; and

---

[11]. Martin Buber, IT,p.16.
[12]. Ibid., pp. 15, 39, 59, 74-75, 85-88; Cf. also, Emil Fackenheim, Buber's Concept of Revelation, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 278-80.
[13]. Ibid., p. 38.
[14]. Ibid., p. 86.

Rarest Archiver

thus it can be understood and be ordered as regards the relationship is concerned. Hence, Buber holds that in the I-IT there exists really the subject and object relation; and the significance of it is of utility and use.[15] The products of the I-IT relational world are the order, security and continuity and it only concerns with the objects of use, utility and experience that are pushed to the future end or goal; and it has no present content. The I-IT relationship is purposely planned and determined for the next time. The I-IT world is the world of experience, things and of object and objectifying the other; and it is a conditioned world of appearance, an inauthentic world, a world of unreal actuality; and the reality here is divided.

In Buber's understanding, there is a primal distance between subject and objects of experience and the distance between them is more and more wide. The kingdom of It is founded by the experience alone and it is through the experience that man attains the knowledge of things of the IT world. The IT world is made up of symbols, images, quantity and quality. As the world occasions the experience, man seems to define the object-world according to number and measure, quantity, weight, colour and species of other nature. Therefore a thing remains a thing among many things. In the world of IT, everything is without reciprocity; and AS EXPERIENCE, the world belongs to the primary word of I-IT attitude of man.[16]

Further, Buber holds that the world of I-IT is the field of causality, calculations, discoveries and fixed laws and so he says, "CAUSALITY HAS, an unlimited reign in the world of

---

15. Ibid., pp. 86-87, Cf. also, Maurice Friedman, Martin Buber, pp.57-58.
16. Ibid., p.18.

Rarest Archiver

IT".[17] We see that the causal laws and their arbitrary consequences determine our human behavior. Thus according to Buber, a work of art, a creature, a fellowman and even my own I (self) all these can be regarded as objects among other objects. They become a thing among other things, occupying particular position in space and time, capable of being measured and analyzed in the I-IT world. The realm of the science is the I-IT and that has the ordered and detached world, which is reliable and has density and duration too. Hence there is no place for the I-Thou relationship.[17] Here the question is raised as to, 'can all personal relationships become I-IT relation, and the human race and culture are subjected to the strong grip of the IT world, where the principle of non-unlimited causality only has power and has only one limitless direction in the relationship? To this query Buber says, "The dogma of a gradual process is the abdication of man before the exuberant world of IT. He who is overcome by the world of IT is bound to see, in the dogma of immutable process, a truth that clears a way through the exuberant growth; in very truth this dogma enslaves him only the more deeply to the world of IT".[18]

In Buber's opinion, all the transitive words have something as object and they belong to the world of I-IT; and for example, to perceive, to want, to feel and experience something etc, would be to mean the establishment of the world of the IT realm. Taken together, they include the whole range of our experience of everything. According to Buber, to this IT world

---

17. Ibid., p. 71.
17. H.J. Paton, The Modern Predicament (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1955), pp. 166-67
18. Martin Buber, IT,pp. 78-80; Cf. also, Beek and Weiland, Martin Buber, pp,. 58-59.

Rarest Archiver

belongs the whole domain of science, commerce and industry.[19] To experience, one travels over the outer forms of things and being and experiences them all. In such as a type of experiencing of the things and beings there cannot be real intimacy at all because one has experiences over the other for a long time.[20]

The world of IT is set in the context of space and time; and the world as IT has tangible durability and solidity; and it is through coordination of time and space the world is circumscribed.[21] The world can be arranged in order as only as object of experience. Thus Buber says, "This is part of the basic truth of the human world, that only IT can be arranged in order. Only when things, from being our Thou, become our IT, can they be coordinated. The Thou knows no system of co-ordination".[22]

In so far as man rests satisfied with the things that he experiences and uses, he live in the past; and his moment has no present content and he has nothing but objects. But the objects subsist in time that has been.[23] Hence, the world of I-IT is partial and indirect; and it deals with what is already past, in contrast to the directness, living presence, living presence and wholeness of the world of I-Thou. There is no element of presence and immediacy in the I-IT world.

---

19. Ibid., pp. 50-51; Cf. also, Joseph Houlds Worth Oldham, Real Life is Meeting, (London: The Sheldon Press, 1942), pp. 29-30.
20. Wood, Martin Buber's Ontology, pp. 40-41; Cf. also, Pfuetze, The Social Self, pp. 147-48.
21. Martin Buber, IT,p. 50.
22. Ibid., p. 47.
23. Ibid., pp. 25-26; Cf. also, Jacob Agus, Modern Philosophies of Judaism, (New York: Behrman's Jewish Bookhouse, 1941), pp. 241-42.

Rarest Archiver

In the I-IT world, one adopts to himself an impersonal attitude towards his fellowbeings, thinks of them as mere objects and treats them as IT's. the partner in this world of relationship becomes a means of one's satisfaction; one is interested in the other fellowbeing for just what he can get from him. But Buber understands at this juncture that although, this type of relationship is not worthy of persons, yet to adopt such an attitude is often necessary. It is because, it has to be the expression of knowledge and to act in relation to other human persons one must know or consider them all as objects of knowledge. Therefore, an impersonal attitude towards human beings here is the negative aspect of relational action that is indispensable to it and inclusive in it. So, in Buber's understanding, this type of paradox of man's existence is seem to be the sad antithesis of his life.

Buber holds, "Taking his stand in the shelter of the primary world of separation, which holds off the I and the IT from one another, man has divided his life with his fellowmen into two tidily circled- off provinces, one of institutions and the other of feeling- the province of IT and the province of I. Institutions are 'outside', where all sorts of aims are pursued, where a man works, negotiates, bears influence, undertakes, concurs, organizes, conducts business, officiates, preaches. They are the tolerably well ordered and to some extent harmonious structure, in which, with the manifold help of men's brains and hands, the process of affairs is fulfilled. Feelings are 'within', where life is lived and man recovers from institutions. Here the spectrum of the emotions dances before the interested glance. Here a man's liking and hate and pleasure are indulged, and his pain if it is not too severe. Here he is at home, and stretches himself out in his rocking-

Rarest Archiver

chair".[24] But the separated IT of institutions is an animated clod without soul, and the separated I of feelings and an uneasily fluttering soul-bird. Neither of them knows man: institutions know only the specimen, feelings only the 'object'; neither knows the person, or mutual life. Neither of them knows the present; even the most up-to-date institutions know only the lifeless past that is over and done with, and even the most lasting feelings know only the flitting moment that has not yet come properly into being. Neither of them has access to real life. Institutions yield no public life, and feelings no personal life.[25] Though both of these are necessary, yet even their combination still do not create the life of man. The creation of human life is done only by the third element, i.e., the central presence of the Thou. Therefore in marriage the decisive thing is, not feelings, but where the partners reveal to each other; the authentic Thou and love reign between the two.

But however, Buber is not rejecting the world of IT. He gives the validity to the I-IT attitude in man, when he calls and recognizes I-IT as a primary word; and therefore it is said to be an anthropological category in Buberian system. At this juncture Buber holds that the I-Thou attitude that is incalculable and lacking in stability and duration does not alone do justice to the double nature of man in his relationship with others. His own words in this regard are, "And in all the seriousness of truth, hear this: without IT man cannot live. But he who lives with it alone is not a man.[26] As we have already mentioned, the world of IT offers reliability

---

[24]. Ibid., pp. 62-65.
[25]. Ibid., pp. 63-64.
[26]. Ibid., p. 52.

Rarest Archiver

of experience and continuation in space and time of the human persons in relationship.

According to Buber, the concept of Science would mean the whole of analytical discipline in all the fields of physics, chemistry etc; and these fields of knowledge belong to the IT world. The development of these natural sciences led humanity to the new historical situations of its destiny. As the development of science has led the humanity into the new historical situation, Buber seems to invite the whole of humanity to accept this fact in its freedom and responsibility. Therefore, there is not only a need for knowledge, but also we have a duty to know about it. Hence, Buber maintains that the history and its ways lead the humanity over the necessity and duty to know about it. He teaches that as we cannot always return to the heaven of naivety, we must transform or change this unreal scientific abstraction to a greater reality to make it useful for the humanity and creatures. Thus Buber teaches that, if the humanity has to find the nature, nonetheless it should proceed from this non-realizable, not imaginable, uncanny world of ours.[27]

As we saw above, man acquires an ordered, reliable and predictable world. This is a world of causality and fixed laws that enable man to form a reasonable plan by which he can build, sustain and equip an organized and secure social living. All these are acquired through scientific knowledge by means of dispassionate and objective experiment or observation. This type of acquiring knowledge is the realm of knowledge in Kantian terms. The I-IT world is reliable and stable that sustains man in his life. Without the world perceived by

---

[27]. Martin Buber, Knowledge of Man, ed. With an Intro. Maurice Friedman, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965), pp. 156-57. Hereafter cited as KM.

Rarest Archiver

science and technical knowledge, man cannot hold on to his life. Thus Buber writes, "You cannot hold on to life without it, its reliability sustains you".[28] But further Buber affirms that an ordered world of this kind is not the real world order, but only it is an expression of the world order.[29] Thus, hereby Buber makes clear to us that the I-IT world does not constitute the totality of man's life but it constitutes only one aspect of human life. In the world of I-IT man does not meet his Thou (other). So, he writes, "Should you die in it, your grave will be in nothingness".[29] In the world of I-IT the relationship has no place.

The world of IT overpowers man, when he is lost in his surrounding and fails to enter into relationship with others and if man lets it this way of the IT world, then relentlessly the IT grows like a gigantic swamp figure like phantom and overpowers him depriving of his personal and human dignity. According to Buber, this happens again and again in history of mankind and so he says, "THE HISTORY of the individual and that of the human race, in whatever they may continually part company, agree at least in this one respect, that they indicate a progressive augmentation of the world of IT".[30]

In the light of the above elaboration, we find some contradiction as regards the definition of history in Buber. He holds that it is through the free acceptance of responsibility of man that history comes into being. Because man fails to enter into I-Thou relation and takes his place in the IT world, the I-IT world always brings with it the failure in

---

[28]. Martin Buber, IT,p. 49.
[29]. Ibid., pp. 48-50; Cf. also, Bernard Martin, ed, Great Twentieth Century Jewish Philosophers: Shestov, Rosenzweig, Buber (London: Macmillan, 1962), pp. 248-49.
[29]. Ibid., p.49.
[30]. Ibid., p.55.

Rarest Archiver

responsibility of man. Now the question can be raised as, how can we positively value history, under the aspect of responsibility, if it only brings about an increase of the IT world? And so there seem to be and apparent opposition between the two concepts of history, such as, history, which is characterized as responsibility in freedom, and history, as growth and an increase of the IT world. In the IT world, the causality and fate keep away the free acceptance of the human destiny in responsibility; and where as, the history characterizes itself as responsibility in freedom of man. Now at this juncture Buber seem to resolve and clarify these twofold notions of history through affirming the fact that the increase of the world of IT does not make up the essence of history but it is only an aspect of history. In Buber's understanding, the history is basically constituted of responsibility of man. Thus the more pragmatic view of Buber is that this gigantic growth of IT world should not be an occasion for resignation or distress for us but it should be used to intensify our sense of responsibility; and in other words, the negative strength of this element of IT world has to be the true object of our responsibility.

Buber believes that the IT world has certain privileges for man because it aids him to live a secure and organized life; and it fills every moment of his life with his using and experiencing without which he cannot live. And so Buber says, "Without IT man cannot live".[31] He further maintains that the man who restricts himself to the IT world perspective alone, escapes in doing justice to the whole human existence, though

---

[31]. Ibid., p. 52.

Rarest Archiver

he finds himself besides many other existing persons and beings in the world that he is placed.[32]

In Buber's understanding, in IT world alone, man cannot lead his complete or whole human life. Though the world of IT is the aspect of the ordinary life and the I-Thou seems to be shattering to last very long, yet man can be fully understood as human only in terms of direct and reciprocal relationship of I-Thou world. That is why Buber affirms this aspect in these lines as, "he who lives with the I-IT world alone is not a man", and all real living is meeting".[33] Though the I-IT world belongs to the reality of man's life existence, yet Buber rejects its claim to be absolute. So he says at this juncture, "THE PRIMARY word I-IT is not of evil—as matter is not of evil. It is of evil - as matter is, which presumes to have the quality of present being. If a man lets it have the mastery, the continually growing world of IT overruns him and robs him of the reality of his own I, till the incubus over him and the ghost within him whisper to one another the confession of their non-salvation".[34] Therefore the I-IT world of experience and use is not evil and this IT world is necessary, legitimate, and even natural for us. But if this IT world presumes to be having mastery over us, then it becomes evil.

Now at this juncture Franz Rosenzwing criticizes that Buber's treatise of " I AND THOU' does not seem to be doing any justice to the I-IT world.[35] Buber agrees to the objection of

---

32. Martin Buber, Eclipse of God, Trans. Maurice Friedman, et. al.(New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1958), pp. 127-30. Hereafter cited as EG.
33. Martin Buber, IT,p. 52.
34. Ibid., p. 66.
35. Ernst Simon, Martin Buber, The Educator, in Schilpp, PMB, p. 576; Cf. also, Maurice Friedman, Martin Buber's Life and Work, (Search Press, London and Turnbridge Wells,,Kent. TN2 3DR, 1982), p. 421.

Rarest Archiver

Franz Rosenzwing and clarifies his position. He admits that it is true that he has not done justice to the I-IT world because we are born in the midst of the I-IT situation of man, which we confront and encounter it everyday. Though sometimes we may praise the IT situations, yet presently we cannot do it because without we turn to our Thou (other), no turn in our destiny of life can come about.[36]

5.2. THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THE I-THOU AND THE I-IT

I present here below a schematic presentation of the few major and important points of contrast between the I-Thou (Ich-du-welt) and I-IT (Ich-es-welt) worlds. The Relationship, Meeting, Presence, Being, Destiny, Freedom and Risk are the principle points that belong to the I-Thou world; and the Relationship of Experience, Utilizing, Object, Having, Fate, Discretion or Arbitrary Will and Security are the main concepts that fall under the I-IT world.[37]

According to Buber, man, in order to attain his authentic personality and to realize his deepest levels of his existence, will have to at least occasionally leave the world of knowledge and experience of IT and step into the world of I-Thou relationship. Man's true self can only be found in the world of relationship where persons meet as I and Thou; and in it people meet in mutual self-disclosure, fellowship and human respect.

5.3. THE AUGMENTATION OF THE I AND IT WORLD TODAY

Buber very clearly says, "THE HISTORY of the individual and that of the human race, in whatever they may continually part company, agree at least in this one respect, that they indicate a progressive augmentation of the world of IT". From the primitive man to the man of today's technology and in the

---

[36]. Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, pp.704-705.
[37]. Beek and Weiland, Martin Buber, pp. 58-61.

Rarest Archiver

development of human race, we find the gradual expansion of the I-IT world that is taking place; and at the expense of the I-Thou world relationship, the present progress of civilization is characterized by the power of the enlargement of the I-IT world. As man tries to improve with the ability to experience and use, then generally there is a decrease in his power to relate with others as Thous.[38] And so when man fails to relate with the others as Thous, then there is a danger for human Thou to lose its vitality and its life force. In Buber's strong affirmation, the I-IT world has gigantically swollen up and it has the uncontested mastering rule in our present age. The Lord of the hour is the I of the I-IT relationship, which possesses all, succeeds with all and not able to meet a being essentially, it fails to say Thou to the other.[38]

When there is a progressive tendency to use, to experience and a growing capacity to acquire elements of knowledge for specialized uses, then the Thou attitude in man is lessened. As man fails to enter into I-Thou relationship with the other, which is "only *in virtue of his power to enter into relation* is he able to live in the spirit"[39], there is a progressive development of his ability to experience and use others which comes out. Buber characterized this type of progressive tendency of I-IT world as the sickness of humanity in our times as "modern man's palpable condition of lack of relation" is gigantically growing.[39] so, in this way the capacity for the community in our modern society is dying out. And Buber further

---

[38]. Martin Buber, IT,p, 54; Cf. also, Beek and Weiland, Martin Buber, pp. 62-67

[38]. Martin Buber, EG, pp. 129-130.

[39]. Martin Buber, IT,p. 58.

. Ibid., p.137.

Rarest Archiver

writes that the IT world "steps in between and shuts off from us the light from heaven".[40]

What Buber means here is not the I-IT relation itself, without which our earthly human existence is impossible, but its hubris or insolent pride that overtakes all measures of life. The I-IT is not some demonic power that we have reared.[41] Thus man deep inside his heart feels that this direction of I-IT is leading him to a blind direction instead of leading him to his creative and free life. Thus, today, the I-IT world is the source of pain and despair of modern humanity in the world, which has also eclipsed God, or in other words it has come between the divine countenance and us.[42]

As we are aware of the gigantically growing and increasing I-IT world in the modern times, Buber warns us against this satanic power of IT that disturbs the proper balance between it and I-Thou relationship; and further he invites the humanity to have I-Thou relationships in all the realms of life. In Buber's understanding, the difficult task set for us is to maintain a proper and healthy calculative balance between the worlds of I-IT and I-Thou.

5.4. CLOSING REMARKS

Martin Buber's unique contribution to the present century has been his unrelented emphasis on the dignity of the human being. By steeping himself in the rich fund of Hasidic literature, Buber was able to appropriate the most salient

---

40. Martin Buber, EG, pp. 129-130; Cf. also, Great Ideas Today,(Britannica Great Books,1967); Cf. also, Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 716-17
41. Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp.716-17.
42. Martin Buber, EG, pp. 22-23, 66-69; Cf. also, Great Ideas Today, (Britannica Great Books, 1967), p. 367; Cf. also, Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, pp. 716-17.

Rarest Archiver

Hasidic ideals of spiritual fervor, loving kindness, holiness and joy in the service of God and fellow man; and make of them the very foundation of his own philosophical personalist position. Buber's theistic posture is an invaluable antidote to the dark and despairing atheistic existentialism of Jean Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir (Perhaps even Martin Heidegger and the earlier Albert Camus might be included here). Where Sartre proclaims the death of God as a "valid statement of fact", Buber proclaims an Eternal Thou, ever present in every genuine human interpersonal relationship. This Eternal Thou is the Center, the Bond, the foundation for the between, so absolutely indispensable for every true community, every valid "I-THOU" relationship. While Sartre holds that mankind "must take courage, it must give up once and for all the search for God, it must forget God," Buber counters by asserting that the only way in which man can find a meaningful and authentic existence is against the background of the Eternal Thou (God), who alone gives purpose and rationality to life.

We may aptly close our remarks with the following two tributes penned by Buber's scholars. Eugen Biser wrote the first one just two years before Buber's death in the following words, "Martin Buber stands out as one of the few great minds among us, unbroken by the distress of his people or the burden of a long life, standing upright under the light of true wisdom as one who wants light ever while he speaks of darkness, a man who has increased knowledge and therefore suffering also. He awakens confidence in victory, and he reaches out a brother's hand to everyone who is willing.

Will Herberg evaluates Buber's contribution to twentieth century thought in the following words, "There can be no doubt as to the greatness and originality of Buber's thought. Not since Maimonides in the Middle Ages has there been a Jewish

Rarest Archiver

philosopher who has had such a profound impact upon the religious and humanistic thinking of his time as Martin Buber has had upon the thinking of our generation... What is the secret of this man? In what does that unique power and relevance of his thought consist? I should say that the significance of his thinking consists primarily in this-that he, more than any man of his time, has succeeded in developing a philosophy that does full justice to the unique reality and value of the individual human being over against the mass man. Martin Buber has shown us what it really means to be a human being in the inwardness of the self, in community with others, in fellowship with God. Herein lies his message for our time and for all time".[43]

---

[43]. Francis J. Lescoe, Existentialism, pp. 168-170.

Rarest Archiver

PART TWO

MADHVA'S DVAITA VEDĀNTA

Rarest Archiver

MADHVA'S DVAITA VEDĀNTA

CHAPTER-1

1.0.INTRODUCTION:

The philosophy of Madhvācārya represents theism. Before the commencement of Madhvācārya on the Indian philosophical scene, there had been already well-established systems of Śaṁkara and Rāmānuja. After a long cogitation, Madhva established his new Darśana called Dvaita Vedānta. It is one of the major schools of Vedānta philosophy.

Madhva also known as Ānandatīrtha or Pūrnaprajña belongs to the 13th A.D. It was a period of serious cultural unrest and political turmoil. There were invasions and forceful conversions to new faith by the invaders. Hinduism had absorbed many invading races since the earlier times that entered the country. Madhva influenced the socio-political situations of his times. Madhva siddhāntha is a buoyant realism of Vēdas, the Upaniṣads, transcendental Theism, emotional Theism of Purāṇas and Epics. He holds that man is real agent in this world and not a false reality. He was a staunch opponent of Śaṁkara and Rāmānuja; and was considered to be one of the great commentators of major Vedāntic texts. Madhva was a constructive expounder of the classics of India.[1]

1.1.HAGIOGRAPHY (PREDECESSORS OF MADHVA):

Before we elaborate the date, life and works of Madhva, let us briefly look into the Predecessors of the Ācārya. The following is the traditional Guruparampara down to Madhva: 1. Śrī Hamsa (Nārāyaṇa), 2.Brahma, 3.The Four Sanas, 4.Durvāsas,

---

[1]. B.N. K. Sharma. Madhva' Teachings in his own words,(Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan,1979), pp.3-14.

Rarest Archiver

5. Jñānanidhi Tīrtha, 6.Garudavāhana Tirtha, 7. Kaivalya Tīrtha, 8.Jñānisa Tīrtha, 9.Para Tīrtha, 10.Satyaprajña Tīrtha, 11.Prajña Tīrtha, (Gap of about four hundred years), 12.Acyutaprjña alias Purusottama Tīrtha and 13. Ānanda Tīrtha alias Madhvācārya. The last in this line was Purusottama Tīrtha (M. Vij, vi, 33) alias Acyutaprajña, more commonly called Acyutaprēkṣa, who was the Sannyasa-Guru of Madhva. The very first work on Vedānta in which this teacher instructed Madhva was taught the Iṣṭasiddhi of Vimuktātman (M.Vij. iv, 44). Hence it is obvious that Madhva himself was the actual historical founder and exponent of his system.[2]

1.2.SRI MADHVA'S PARENTS AND HIS BIRTH:

The native land of Śrī Madhvācārya was the Pajaka kṣēthra, a village in Uḍupi town of South Canara district of Karnataka. Madhyagēhabhatta a pious and orthodox Pandith Brahmin was the father of Śrī Madhva, and Vēdāvathy was his mother. They named their son as Vāsudēva.[3]

1.3.DATE AND LIFE OF ŚRĪ MADHVĀCĀRYA.

Madhva was born in the year 1238 A.D of the Christian era and passed away or 'became invisible' as the tradition puts it, in 1317 AD; and 1238-1317 AD.thus appears to be the most satisfactory date for Madhva. Nārāyaṇa Panditācārya one of the youngest sons of Trivikrama an illustrious disciple of Madhva has written an authentic biography of the Ācārya. It is said that as a child he was an extra-ordinary intellectual. At the age of sixteen he was conferred Sannyasa and was named as Pūrnaprajña by a renowned Advaita teacher called Acyutaprēkṣacārya.

---

2. B.N.K. Sharma, History of the Dvaita School of Vedānta and its Literature,(Delhi: Motilal Banrsidas, 1981), pp.75-77.
3. C.M.Padmanābhachārya, Life and Teachings of Sri Madhvāchārya,(Uḍupi: Paryaya Śrī Palimar Mutt), pp.3-4.

Rarest Archiver

He studied the Śāstras and was convinced of the inherent weakness of the Advaita philosophy. He had keen desire to resuscitate the ancient Theism of the Vēdaśāstras on the basis of reinterpretation of the texts.

Madhva opposed Śaṅkara's monistic tenets. He studied the sacred texts independently and came to the conclusion that they do not propagate Māyāvāda. On the other hand they have Realistic Theism proclaiming Viṣṇusarvōttamatva as their essence and purport. "Ānandatīrtha" was another new name that was given to Madhva by Acyutaprēkṣa with which Madhva himself calls in many of his works. He is known popularly by the name Madhvācārya.

Madhva undertook extensive tours towards South and North India. He popularized his new doctrine. During the course of his tours he challenged many of his opponents in public disputes and won over them to his side. His successful disputations were with Vāsudēva Pandita, Vadisimha and Buddhisāgara. The eminent scholars like Sōbhana Bhatta under the name Padmanābhatīrtha, Swami Śāstri under the name of Naraharitīrtha, and Madhva's own preceptor Acyutaprēksacārya were all got converted and became the staunch followers of the theism of Madhva.

Śrī Madhva firmly established his philosophical doctrines through his substantial works that has since then become a strong center of the Dvaita Vedānta. He lived for seventy-nine years. He departed for Badari. On the ninth day of the bright half of Magha, in Pingala, 1317 A.D., he became invisible while preaching the Upaniṣads. Madhva proclaims himself as the third incarnation of Vāyu after Hanuman and Bhīma.[4]

Helmuth Von Glasenapp, Viṣnu Faith, ed.K.T. Pandurangi, (Bangalore:Dvaita Vedānta Studies and Research Foudation,1992), p.1.

Rarest Archiver

Madhva in short was a many-sided personality. Śrī Madhva had many disciples. He ordained of them to Sannyas. They were: Padmanabhatīrtha, Naraharitīrtha and Aksobyatīrtha; Padmanabhatīrtha was a great scholar at the court of King Mahadeva of Yādva Dynasty and lived in Paithan. He was chiefly responsible for the propagation of Dvaita Vedānta in Karnataka, Andra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Maharastra.

After "Madhvāchārya", a few great commentators wrote scholarly commentaries and highlighted Dvaita doctrines. Prominent among them are Jayatīrtha, Vyāsarāja, Raghuttama, Vādiraja, Vidyādhīsa, Rāghavendra, Jagannātha yati and a few others. Haridāsa literature has been another feature of Dvaita Vedānta. Great Mystics like Śrīpadarāja, Vyāsarāja, Purandaradāsa, Vijayadāsa, Jagannathadāsa have contributed to Haridāsa literature. This literature is in Kannada language and in the form of Songs; and it enkindles Bhakti. It has contributed to Indian Music considerably.[5]

1.4.MADHVA AS A WRITER, THINKER AND A MYSTIC:

Madhva was a prolific writer in Sanskrit. He commanded prose and verse with equal ease. His prose is terse and telling. He is known for brevity of expression and he scrupulously avoids the ornate style. His verses have solemnity, dignity and deep spiritual eloquence. He liked debates and disputations with scholars of the day and was an adept in logical and dialectical subtleties.

Madhva had a brilliant insight into the problems of philosophy. His knowledge of the sacred literature of his country was accurate and exhaustive. He quotes profusely from an exceptionally wide range of works the Mantras, Brahmanas, Khilas, Aranyakas, Upaniṣads, Epics, Purānas, Pancarātras and

---

5. K.T.Pandurangi, Dvaita Vedānta Darśana of Śrī Madhvāchāraya, pp.1-3

Rarest Archiver

a variety of ancillary literatures. Among Vedāntins, he has drawn to the largest extent upon the Ṛig Vēda. In Madhva there is a deep mystic strain that comes out occasionally in his writings. Flashes of his mysticism are evident in the outpourings of his heart to God in his Dvadaṣa-Stōtra.

1.5.WORKS OF MADHVA.

Madhva, as already said, is the most prolific writer in Sanskrit. He is one of the greatest Bhāṣyakāras of the Vedānta system. The works of Madhva are thirty-seven in numbers. They could be listed as follows:

1.Commentaries on Prasthānatraya:

a) Works on Gītā-Prasthāna

i). Bhagavadgīta-bhāṣya

ii).Bhāgavata-tātparyanirṇaya

b) Works on Sūtraprasthāna

i). Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya

ii).Brhama-sūtra-Anubhāṣya

iii) Brahma-sūtra-Anuvyākhyana

iv) Brahma-Sūtra-Anuvyākhyānyāya-Vivaraṇa

c)Works on Upaniṣad-prasthāna

i) Aitarēya-upaniṣad-bhāṣya

ii) Bṛhadāraṇyaka-upaniṣad-bhāṣya

iii) Chāndogya-upaniṣad-bhāṣya

iv) Taittirīya-upaniṣad-bhāṣya

v) Īśāvāsya-upaniṣad-bhāṣya

vi) Kāṭhaka-upaniṣad-bhāṣya

vii) Ātharvaṇa- (Mundaka)-upaniṣad-bhāṣya

viii) Māṇduka- (Māṇḍukya)-upaniṣad-bhāṣya

ix) Ṣatpraśna-upaniṣad-bhāṣya

x) Talavakāra- (Kēna)-upaniṣad-bhāṣya

2.Daśa Prakaraṇa:

a)Kathā-lakṣaṇa-on the means of polemics

b)Pramāṇa-lakṣaṇa-on the norms of knowledge

Rarest Archiver

c) Prapañca Mithyātvāumana Khaṇḍana-rebuttal of the doctrine of advaitins that the plurality of the world is only an illusion.
d) Upādhi-Khaṇḍana-Rebuttal of the Upādhi-theory of Advaitins.
e) Māyāvāda Khaṇḍana-Rebuttal of the māyā-doctrine of Advaitins
f) Tattva saṁkhyāna-Enumeration of the world principles
g) Tattva vivēka-on the different world principles
h) Tattvōdyōta-Defense of Dvaita doctrine
i) Viṣnutattva vinirṇaya-on the nature of Viṣṇu
j) Karma Nirṇaya-Aim of Vēda is to reveal Brahman
3. Works on Vēdas, Itihāsas and Purāṇas
a) Ṛg-bhāṣya-commentary on Ṛg-Vēda I, 1-40
b) Mahābhārata-tātparya-nirṇaya
c) Yamaka-Bhārata (Mahābhārata-tātparya)
d) Bhāgavata- (Purāṇa)-tātparyanirṇaya
4. Minor works which embody the highest Philosophical, Ethical, Religious insights:
a) Sadācāra - smṛti- on daily religious duties.
b) Kṛṣnāmṛta-maharṇava-On good works and rites
c) Tantrasāra - saṁgraha - On mantras, idols and meditations etc.
d) Yatipraṇavakalpa - Instruction of a pupil by the teacher on correct meditation.
e) Dvādasāst ōtra-12 hymns on Viṣṇu
f) Narashiṁha-nakha-st ōtra-Hymns on Viṣṇu as Narasiṁha
g) Jayantī-nirṇaya-On the celebration of Kṛṣna's birth anniversary.

To this list of 37, Bannanje Govindācārya adds three more books (Bannanje Govindācārya, Madhvācārya, pp.23-24): -
a) Nyāsapaddhati-Daily routine duties of mendicants
b) Tithinirṇaya-Unique work on the mathematics of Calendar
c) Kaṇduka-stuti-Composed by the Ācārya in his boyhood.

Rarest Archiver

Among the works of Madhvācārya the greatest, by general agreement, is Aṇu-vyākhyāna. On Madhva's works brilliant commentaries have been written by Jayatīrtha called *Tīkas*. In particular, his commentary on Aṇuvyākhyāna, called Nyāyasudha, is of highest merit. Vyāsatīrtha also has written brilliant commentaries on Madhva's works. Dr. S.N. Dasgupta says, "Jayatīrtha and Vyāsatīrtha present the highest dialectical skill... almost unrivalled in the whole field of Indian thought".[6]

1.6.THE STYLE OF MADHVA'S WRITINGS.

Madhva is a difficult Hindu philosophical writer in Vedānta system because of his aphoristic style. To understand his writings and thought, one will have to go into some initiation and seek the help of commentaries.[7]

---

6. S.N. Dasgupta, A History of Philosophy, Vol.IV,(Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass,1975), Preface,p.viii;Dominic, God-World-Soul, Acc. To St. Thomas and Śrī. Madhvācārya,(1995), pp.428-431.
7. B.N.K.Sharma, Madhva's Teachings, pp.25-30.

Rarest Archiver

CHAPTER-2

DVAITA IN OUTLINE.

2.1.A BACKGROUND TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF MADHVĀCĀRYA:

The position of Madhvācārya is this: 'Brahman is the ground of the universe. The universe consists of cētana (spirit) and acētana (matter). It is as real as Brahman. It is not mithya. The soul is also real. It asserts itself as real. In what sense real? There are three senses in which a thing can be real. A thing is real if it has an existence of its own; if it has knowledge (pramiti) or if it has its own function (pravrtti). Cētana is real in all these three senses and acētana is real in the first and the last senses. But in every sense of the term, the reality of the world is dependent. A depenedent reality, if it is existent, should have its source in something else. This source is independent (svatantra). It is changeless. It is perfect that is Brahman. Brhaman is immanent in the world and the latter has reality from it. By Itself Brhaman is transcendent. Being both immanent and transcendent It is the necessary presupposition of the world. Without It the world is not. But with It the world is. In virtue of this conception of the dependent nature of the world this system is called Dvaita.[1]

We can sum up the Dvaita system of Madhvācārya thus: 'This empirical world is real and jiva (soul) is really different from Brahman and non-identical with Him. Both cit (spirit) and acit (matter) altogether are different realities

---

1. H.N.Rāghavendrachār, ... The Dvaita Philosophy and its place in the Vedānta, (Mysore: University of Mysore,1941), p.12.

Rarest Archiver

from Brahman. His system advocates that there exists the reality of five-fold differences (bhēda) between - 1.Soul and God. 2. Soul and Soul. 3. Soul and matter. 4.God and matter and 5.One material thing and another. Bhēda is the central concept of his system and because of this reason it is called Dualism or the Dvaita philosophy. The system of Madhva can rightly be called as pluralistic, realistic, and theistic because he believes in the reality of the external world and the personal God who alone is Svatantra (independent) and all other real beings altogether depend on Him alone.

2.2.SRI MADHVA'S DVAITA VEDĀNTA IN SUMMARY:

The Dvaita Vedānta of Madhvācārya, is pluralistic, theistic and realistic philosophy and its philosophical tenets are derived from three authoritative aspects called Prasthānas - Sūtraprasthāna, Upaniṣadprasthāna, Gītaprasthāna and from Purāṇas and Mahābhārata. H.V. Glasenapp quotes the immortal lines of Madhva's doctrine that are summarized in the celebrated verse by Vyāsa-rāya one of the eminent exponents of Madhvācārya: -

"Śrīman-Madhva-mate Hariḥ paratarah Satyam jagat, tattvato bhēdo,Jīva-gaṇa, Harer anucarah, nicocca-bhāvam gatah, muktir naija-Sukhanubhūtir, amala bhaktis' Ca tat-sādhanam akṣadi-trityamPramānam, akhilamānyaika-vēdyo Hariḥ".

This memorial-verse attributed to Śrī Vyāsatīrtha, summarizes the quintessence of Madhva's philosophy in nine points (nava prameya-ratnāni). Śrīman Madhva teaches that Viṣṇu (Hari) is the supreme God, the world is real and the difference between God and soul does actually exist; all the living beings are dependent upon Viṣṇu, and they are divided into higher and lower classes; Liberation consists in the enjoyment of the bliss that is inherent in oneself; pure devotion is the means of attaining it. The means of knowledge

Rarest Archiver

(pramāṇas) are perception, inference, and verbal testimony (revealed scripture). The sole purport of the entire Vēdic revelation is Hari.[2]

2.3. 'REALITY' (TRUTH) IN MADHVĀCĀRYA:

Essentially as an Epistemological animal, man has an unquenchable and irrepressible thirst for knowledge. Every system of philosophy deals with the problem of knowledge and gives prime importance to it and therefore the basic form of every philosophical system is to discuss on the nature, scope, and varieties of knowledge, the reliable or unreliability of human knowing and the validity of knowledge. Therefore man initially takes recourse to Epistemology in pursuing and searching the Truth. Madhvacarya's philosophical thoughts and his doctrine of the Supreme Being (God) man (jīva) and world (jagat) without exception are built upon Epistemological and Metaphysical foundations.

The human soul is for the eternal and unmixed bliss of mukti or liberation, which can be attained only through constant devotion to God. Such devotion is dependent on the knowledge of the Lord and this knowledge is possible only through the instruments of valid knowledge. We may mention here the nature and validity of the Pramāṇas in the philosophy of Dvaita.

Knowledge is dependent on its object. The relation between knowledge and its object is natural. There are two types of knowledge, svarūpa-jñāna, and vṛttijñāna. The former is generated by sākṣi and the latter by the external sense organs and manas (mind). The former is as a rule true, and the latter is true or untrue according to the conditions. The falsity of knowledge consists in grasping the real as unreal

---

2. Ibid.,,p.116;H.V. Glasenapp, Op.Cit.,pp.68-69.

Rarest Archiver

and the unreal as unreal. True knowledge is generated by pramāṇas. There are three pramāṇas pratyakṣa, anumana, and āgama.

The object of knowledge according to Madhva is a qualified entity. It consists of having substantive-attributive aspects. The attributes of a thing are identical with it. Yet they are distinguished as attributes owing to visesa. Visesa is in all things, including even Brahman. In each thing its number is infinite. The world is real. It consists of different entities. Difference is real. The entities of the world may be brought under two heads, cētana, and acētana. Cētana is that which knows. There are many cētanas. There are three kinds of them, good, bad, and of doubtful character. Acētana is that which does not know. There are three kinds of acētana things, eternal, eternal-non--eternal, and non-eternal. The Vēda is eternal. Space, time, and prakṛti are eternal-non-eternal. The products of prakṛti are non-eternal. A product has two kinds of causes, material, and efficient cause. The relation between a product and its material cause is identity in difference. Non-existence also is real. The world is dependent and points to an Independent Reality as its source. The Independent is Brahman and it is the ground of all that is dependent. The world being dependent is different from Brahman.

The bondage of a cetana is caused by its ignorance of the truth that Brahman is the sole ground of all including itself. It becomes free with the realization of this truth. The course of the discipline that leads to this realization presupposes moral perfection it consists of, in order that study of sastra (śravaṇa), philosophical reflection (manana), and the application to and the teaching of philosophy (nididhyāsana). With this discipline a cētana realizes Brahman as its ground

Rarest Archiver

(biṃba) and with the fullness of its devotion (bhakti) to Brahman obtains the grace of Brahman and with it and cētana has the enjoyment (bhōga) of perfection according to its capacity (yōgyata). This is its mukti.[3]

2.4.ORDERS OF REALITY:

According to Madhva there are two orders of reality- 1.Independent and 2.Dependent. We are confronted with diversities in the world like the 'other selves' like us around us too have greater impacts upon us. Our apprehension of the 'reality' is as 'many' and not as 'one'. Any attempt to reduce 'many' to a mere appearance ends up in nihilism, which is an escapist philosophy. Madhva stresses on the distinction between the 'Independent' and 'Dependent' Realities. He is a critical realist and considers everything to be real. For Madhva, there are three pramāṇas of knowledge, they are, Pratyaksa (perception), Anumana (inference) and Sākṣi (internal witness). In all these there underlies what is called Sākṣi.

2.5.THE SĀKṢI:

According to Madhva, Sākṣi is the highest instrument of all the valid knowledge and the experiences of man. It examines the knowledge that is derived through the senses. Knowledge derived through saksi remains incontrovertible and non-contradictable. For Madhva, 'Sākṣi-pratyakṣa' is fundamentally an internal experience of judgment and values.

2.6 THE UNIVERSE:

The universe we experience is a mysterious universe. The Supreme Being Brahman (God) is the creator-sustainer of this vast universe. This Independent and ultimate principle controls and connects all other dependent reals. Thus Madhva

---

[3]. Ibid., pp.119-120.

Rarest Archiver

dichotomizes the reality as a whole, into 'Sva-tantra and 'Para-tantra in his B.S.B.1, 2, 17. Madhva maintains that in order to preserve the trans-empirical oneness of Brahman, it is not necessary to deny the reality of the world-experience and in no way the finite by reason of its metaphysical dependence challenge or constitute to the ideology of the Absolute Brahman; and this Upanisadic Brahman remains the One without the second.

2.7.THE PRAMĀṆAS:

The greatest yearning of the human soul is for the eternal and unmixed bliss of mukti or liberation, which can be attained only through constant devotion to God. Such devotion is possible only when we have the knowledge of the Lord and this knowledge is possible only through the instruments of valid knowledge. This is the need for a detailed study of the nature and validity of the Pramāṇas in the philosophy of Dvaita.[4]

The starting point of Tattvasāstras or the most classical Indian systems including Dvaita Vedānta is the enquiry into the nature of reality and discussion on the varieties and sources of the nature of knowledge. The Indian systems have recognized the very importance of the Pramāṇa - vicāra. Among the many works of Madhva there are long discussions on the problem of knowledge especially in his short treatise called "Pramaṇalakṣaṇa". According to him, it is the philosophical inquiry that tests the truth in the light of proofs.

Madhva opens his short treatise on knowledge "Pramāṇalakṣaṇa" with the statement: "Pramāṇa is a valid knowledge (Yathārtham Pramāṇam). It is the revelation or

---

Nagaraja Rao, The Epistemology of Dvaita Vedānta,(Madras: The Adyar Library &Research Centre,1976), p.12, Dominic, Op.Cit.,p.28.

Rarest Archiver

cognition of an object as it is, i.e. a cognition, which does not go beyond the object of knowledge. In this sense, Śrī Madhva uses the word Pramāṇa in two senses: a) True and objective knowledge, b) Means of obtaining true knowledge. The first he calls Kēvala Pramāṇa and the second Aṇu Pramāṇa (Pramāṇalakṣaṇa (Prl.) Yathārthajñānam Kevalam tat Sādhanam anuprmānam.[5]

The other schools of Indian philosophy understand that the term Pramāṇa applies to the means of valid knowledge only. Madhva admits three distinct means of knowledge (aṇu pramāṇa). They are perception (pratyakṣa), inference (anumana), and verbal testimony (sabda). Kevala pramāṇa is divided into four types, in the descending order of merit as Īśvara-Jñāna, Laksmi-jñāna, Yogi-jñāna, and Ayōgi-jñāna, on the basis of intrinsic differences in quality, luminosity, and range. The first two are in the nature of Svarūpa-jñāna alone, while the other two include Vṛtti-jñāna (sensory knowledge) also. Īśvara-jñāna or the knowledge possessed by Īśvara is all comprehensive, veridical, eternal, luminous and fully valid. Laksmi-jñāna is next only to God's, in these respects and is dependent on God. Yōgi-jñāna is that knowledge which is obtained by yōgins through their yōgic power as a result of their meditation on Īśvara. The ramifications of yōgi-jñāna include those of Ṛju, Tāttvika and Atāttvika souls, and Ayōgi-jñāna, which is invalid knowledge, is possessed by other souls like mukti-yōgyas, Nitya saṁsārins and Tamoyōgyās.[6]

"Pramāṇa is that which grasps its object as it is. An object is so called because it is grasped by Pramā. Both Pramā

---

5. Dominic,Op.Cit.,p.28.
6. B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya, (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991), p.130; Nāgarāja Rao, Op.Cit., pp.19-26; Dominic,Op.Cit.,pp.28-29.

Rarest Archiver

and its instrument are seen to grasp the same object. The instrument is viewed as grasping the object, because it generates the Pramā that grasps the same. So grasping the object is immediate in the case of Pramā, and mediate in the case of the instrument. If yathārtha is Pramāṇa, then it inevitably follows that Pramā is Pramāṇa in the sense of its being immediate, and its instrument is Pramāṇa because it generates Pramāṇa knowledge. The definitions of the previous thinkers suffer from the defect that they all exclude Pramā from the field of Pramāṇa.

So both Pramā and its instrument are Pramāṇa. The former is immediate. The latter is mediate. To indicate this distinction the former is called kēvalapramāṇa, and the latter anupramāṇa.

2.8.KĒVALAPRAMĀNA:

Pramā is kēvalapramāṇa. According to this system there are four types of kēvalapramāṇa belonging respectively to Īśa, Laksmi, Yōgin, and Ayōgin. An Ayōgin is a being like ourselves. There are different kinds of Pramā. They are the Pramā that is produced by Sākṣi including self-consciousness, the Pramā that is produced by manas with or without the help of the external sense organs, and the Pramā produced by anumāna and āgama.[7]

2.9.ANU PRAMĀṆAS:

They are the means of obtaining true knowledge. They are three in number: 1.Pratyakṣa (Sense perception), 2.Anumāna (Inference), and 3. Āgama (Scripture). "Perception is the flawless contact of sense-organs with their appropriate

---

7. Rāghavendrachār, Op.cit, p.153.

Rarest Archiver

objects. Flawless reasoning is inference. Flawless word, conveying valid sense, is Āgama.[8]

2.10.PERCEPTION (PRATYAKṢA):

Perception, as a process of knowledge, is defined by Madhva as the "contact between the defectless object and the defectless sense"(Prl-"Nirdoṣarthēndriya sannikarsam pratyakṣam"). Thus Pratyakṣa is the defectless sense organ (indriya). The knowledge that is derived from this sense-object contact is perceptual knowledge. This perceptual knowledge to be valid, both senses and objects are to be free from defects. The defects in objects and senses bring out the invalid knowledge that produces illusion or doubt.

There are seven senses (indriyās) of knowledge according to Madhva. The five external senses are: - Sight, hearing, smell, taste, touch, and the mind (manas), and Sākṣin (internal witness) are the internal senses.

2.11.MIND (MANAS):

It co-ordinates the knowledge that is derived by the five external senses and it acts as a means to recollection or memory. Thus it is a seat of memory. Manas (mind) also works as an intermediary between the external object and the knowing-subject. As it is the internal instrument it is also called as "antaḥkaraṇa". Through this antaḥkaraṇa that the internal witness (Sākṣin) directs the energies of the knowledge and activity.

2.12.SĀKṢIN (INTERNAL WITNESS) -THE SEVENTH SENSE:

According to Madhva, Sākṣi is the ultimate knowing agent or source of knowledge. Sākṣin is said to be the purest form of Indriya. It is called as witnessing consciousness. It

---

8. Prl.,Madhvācārya, Śrīmad Viṣṇu-Tattva-Vinīrṇaya, Trans. S.S.Rāghavacar,(Mangalore: Śrī Ramakrishna Āshrama.1959), VTV No. 81,pp.18-21.

Rarest Archiver

directly perceives. In the individual soul Sākṣin is the essential attribute of consciousness. It functions in two stages. In the first stage it produces the knowledge. In the second stage it ascertains its presence and validity. Therefore Sākṣin is the first perceiver of the objects that are presented to all other senses. The perception of Sākṣin is indirect. And also Sākṣin perceives directly those objects that cannot be perceived by other senses. These objects are, 1.The nature of the self (Ātman) and its attributes; the five senses, manas(mind) and its attributes,viz, pleasure(sukha), time(Kāla) and the unmanifested ether(avyakrta-akaśa). The most important characteristic mark of the Sākṣi perception would be the 'I- Consciousness'. The Sākṣin looks at the 'Self' as an object here and therefore it is the self-knowledge.

How is the consciousness belonging to the self is distinguished from the self as such? Madhva says, it is by the virtue of Viśeṣa. Thus perception of the self as an object by the sākṣin is rendered possible. The sākṣin unites all our various cognitions. Secondly, the sākṣin is completely free from defects and therefore posses absolute validity. According to Madhva the perceptual knowledge is immediate knowledge called Sākṣātkāra.

2.13.INFERENCE (ANUMĀNA):

Anumāna is a faultless proof or deduction according to Madhva.[9] Hetu, yukti, linga, and vyapya mean the same. In these things hetu (middle term) is along with its sādhya (major term and conclusion or the proved). Thus hetu along with sādhya is the necessary condition of anumāna that is drawn. There is an invariable relation between hetu and

---

9. Prl:Nirdoṣapapattir anuma; S.S.Rāghavacār,VTV No.81,p.18.

Rarest Archiver

sādhya. This is called Vyāpti (concomitance). And this concomitance is the nerve of the inference (anumāna).

2.14.VERBAL TESTIMONY (ŚABDA-WORD OR ĀGAMA):

Madhva defines the verbal testimony as 'faultless śabda or word (Prl. Nirdōṣasabda agamaḥ). Śabda includes a word, a phrase, a sentence, a whole speech. Śabda conveys a definite meaning expressing a thing as it is. Verbal testimony (āgama) is of two kinds. Pauruśeya (non-eternal or smṛti) testimony and apauresēya (eternal or Vēdic) testimony. The pauruśeya or personal testimony is a human testimony. It is valid if it is in conformity with apauruśeya āgama, i.e. Vēdas or śruti. So far as philosophical and religious questions are concerned, the pauruśeya āgamas, which Śrī Madhva considers as authoritative, are a) Mūla Rāmāyaṇa b) Mahābhārata c) Pancarātra āgama. Other smṛtis and purāṇas which are in conformity with the Vēdas and with above conditions, insofar as they are in conformity, are also authoritative.[10]

Apauruśeya āgamas are non-personal, which means they don't have author, human or divine (VTV. No.13-16). The sacred texts, i.e. the four Vēdas are apauruśeya; they are beginningless and eternal (VTV.No. 41). They are ipso facto true. These four Vēdas (sacred texts) are called svataḥpramāṇa, i.e their truth is self-evident (VTV. No.21). According to Dvaita Vedānta, these sacred texts carry their own mark of truthfulness and they are non-dependent on any other for their author (Cf. VTV. No.22-23). These sacred texts alone give us access to God and to the knowledge of the supra-sensible realities.[11]

---

10. C.R.Krishna Rao, Śrī Madhva, His Life and Doctrine,(Udupi:Śrī Mādhva Muni Seva Sangha,1929),p.48; Dominic,Op.Cit.,p.32.
11. Dominic, Op.Cit.,p.32-33.

Rarest Archiver

2.15.RELATIVE STRENGTH OF THE ANU PRAMANAS: -

Dvaita recognizes, Pratyakṣa (sense perception), Anumāna (inference) and Āgama (śabda- word - scripture - Śruti and Smṛti) as the three Pramāṇas or sources of knowledge. These three Pramāṇas have validity in their own spheres. Pratyakṣa, for instance, has authority in matters empirical and Śruti in matters of transcendental truths.

According to Madhva, within the realm of the perceptual world, pratyakṣa has unquestioned authority and in the same manner the transcendental reality is known only through śruti. In the scheme of the pramāṇas, Madhva gives a special place to pratyakṣa. Both anumāna and Śruti can be wrong, if they go against the verdict of pratyakṣa. Śruti has to be interpreted in a manner consistent with pratyakṣa (Cf.VTV. No.81-82 and T.P. Ramachandran, Dvaita Vedanta, p.28). Madhva would hold that ' the texts in the Upaniṣads which "apparently" speak of the God-soul identity should be interpreted in accordance with experience.[12]

2.16.MEMORY- SOURCE OF VALID KNOWLEDGE:

According to Madhva, memory is a pramāṇa or source of valid knowledge. Memory comes under perception-pratyakṣa and it is a direct perception called Manasa-Pratyaksa. The saṁskāras (impressions) generally cause memory that are left on the mind by the first experiences. And the mind perceives them immediately or directly. Therefore memory is a valid source of knowledge. The inference (anumāna) and the secondaray scriptures (smṛti) both depend on memory. Vyāpti is based on our memory of uniform instances. Thus both anumāna and smṛti will have validity only when memory is considered as a source of valid knowledge.

---

[12]. S.S.Rāghavacār, VTV. No.81-82, pp.18-22; Dominic, Op.Cit., p.33.

Rarest Archiver

2.17.DOCTRINE OF SAKṢI:

Pramāṇas give us valid knowledge of things "as they are. Madhva holds that validity is intrinsic to pramāṇa, which is defined as Yathārtham, yet there is the possibility of error in experience. Right knowledge must carry its own proof. If the right knowledge depends for its validity on the extrinsic factors, the process will be endless regress. Right knowledge to be valid, it should be "Svataḥpramāṇya- self valid. The knowledge derived through the mind and senses is open to many limitations, so knowledge as an activity of the mind cannot be invested with any kind of self-luminosity (svaprakāśa) or self-validity (svapramāṇya).

The acceptance of Sākṣi is rendered necessary, says Madhva, by the very limitations of other means of knowledge open to us viz., the mind, and the senses. Our experiences show that knowledge derived through the sense organs, inferences and verbal testimony and interpreted by the mind, is not always free from doubt, miscarriage or misapprehension. Different persons require different degrees of certification of validity of their knowledge. Even the appeal to non-contradiction would be no avail; since non-contradiction, in the sense of a particular knowledge having remained uncontradicted so far, is no proof of its non-liability to contradiction in future.[13]

At this juncture what can be the ultimate and absolute principle or test of the validity of knowledge that has the power to endorse the validity of its contents? Is the question. According to Madhva, such a power only can belong to principle of truth-determination that is not materially constituted like the mind and that can be credited with

---

[13]. B.N.K.Sharma, Teaching, p.47-48.

Rarest Archiver

absolute validity in all judgments. This ultimate principle of knowledge and validation is the inner sense (organ), of the self of man (his "Svarupēndriyam"), which Madhva calls as "Sākṣi". This sākṣi is the "Jñānagrāhaka-intuitor of knowledge and the Jñānapramānya-grāhaka of the validity of knowledge.[14]

2.18.ETYMOLOGICAL MEANING OF SĀKṢI:

'Sāṣkin' etymologically means a 'witness', 'a seer' or one endowed with vision. It is defined as "Sākṣadiksate iti sākṣi" in Dvaita Vedānta (Cf. Gītabhāsyam IX, 18). For, the Sākṣi is no other than the Self(pramāta). It is also its Caitanya-indriya (essential sense organ partaking of the nature of consciousness). Its distinction into Self and its organ is one of reference and not essence. Thus the essential attribute of the Self (Pramāta) is the consciousness that is called 'Sāṣkin'. Sākṣin is the faculty of the knowing self or cognition.[15] Thus It (Sākṣi) may be identified, as the 'Apperceiver' of all our conscious states and their validity where such validity is present and is desired to be grasped. Whereas, the judgments of the Sākṣi cannot be doubted and have never been shown to have been in the wrong and invalidated at any time in life."

2.19.SĀKṢI AS THE ULTIMATE CRITIRION OF TRUTH:

As manas (mind) is insentient (jada) and it cannot reveal the existence and validity of knowledge, it is in the power of Sākṣin to reveal the presence and the validity of knowledge. The constant witness of all the knowledge that is taking place by the activity of the mind (manas) and to ascertain its validity is the work of Sākṣin. In his Anuvyākhyāna Madhva convincingly demonstrates it in this way

---

14. B.N.K.Sharma, philosophy p.160
15. T.P.Ramachandran, Dvaita Vedānta, (New Delhi: Arnold Heinnman,1976),p.123.

Rarest Archiver

"The mere awareness of a knowledge does not necessarily reveal its validity. Such validity is not realized at the very outset, in sensory and other forms of knowledge. It is only when it is intuited by the Sākṣin, with or without the aid of tests that the true nature of validity, comes to be clearly and fully realized and manifested.[16]

Sākṣi-pratyakṣa has the infallible quality and self-validation. The experiences and judgments of the Sākṣi cannot be doubted, invalidated, or mistaken at any time in our conscious experience. But the fact is that the mind (manas) and senses as they are materially constituted may likely to err and they are also open to misconception. Madhva writes in his Anuvyākhyana, "What is established by the flawless verdict of Sākṣi, must be regarded as true and valid for all time. The very validation of knowledge depends upon the Sākṣi which is the ultimate principle that knows the knowledge".[17]

According to Madhva, vṛtti-jñāna cannot reveal or validate itself and it needs to be tested or Parīkṣa (in respect of sensory and other forms of vṛtti-jñāna) for their validity. This parīkṣa or test is done by sākṣi, which is the spiritual organ of the self. Sākṣi intuits its experiences and thereby establishes the validity of knowledge.Dvaita places Sākṣi above all doubts and vacillations and it is made an absolute principle of infallibility and so it is not touched by any tint of uncertainty. In his Anuvyākhya, Madhva writes: "whether a given experience is true or false is to be ascertained by the sākṣi. If this sākṣi (the truth-determining principle) should become tainted even in a single instance, there can be no certitude at all in epistemology. In order, therefore, to stabilize and guarantee the validity of all the

---

16. AV.iii, p.49, B.N.K.Sharma, Teachings, p.48.
17. AV, iii, p.49; B.N.K.Sharma, Teaching, p.50.

Rarest Archiver

accepted values of life and transactions, lay and scientific carried on their foundations, the sākṣi will have to be accepted as the one flawless principle and criterion of validity by all of us. Once the flawlessness of sākṣi is established, there is no fear of any regress in accepting the sākṣi as the validating principle, for it is capable of grasping its validity and the validity of its judgments without appealing to any further authority, outside itself"(AV. ii, 3, 28).

The inner tribunal of all knowledge and validity is sākṣi. "Without recognizing the Sākṣi, it would be idle to talk of knowledge of any kind. Whatever then is proved to exist on the flawless evidence of Sākṣi must be accepted as real and true and not open to sublation. We think, reason, and feel pleasure and pain. Theses are as self-evident to the Sākṣi as its own existence.[18]

2.20.EPISTEMOLOGICAL BASIS OF MADHVA'S PHILOSOPHY:

The truth of the unreality of the world, the identity of Jīva and Brhaman, all these have to be brought before the bar of Sākṣi before they can be accepted without question, as Sākṣi is the fundamental criterion of validity, of truth and error in the last analysis of all experiences.

According to Madhva "Therefore scripture (Āgama) has no overriding validity where it conflicts with the well-tested pratyakṣa, because, in such cases, the knowledge arising from sense-perception is the basis or fundamental ground (upajīvya). In other cases where scriptural statements happen to be the sole proof and guarantor of the truths which fall exclusively within their purview (and do not fall within the range of ordinary perception including the sākṣin), the

---

[18]. AV. p.14b; B.N.K.Sharma, Teachings, p.53.

Rarest Archiver

position is reversed (eg. Avatāras of God). In matters which fall entirely within the scope of worldly experience, it is perception (of the senses as tested by the saksi) that remains the basis and the standing-ground (upajivya) with reference to Āgama when its teachings conflict with the testimony of such pratyakṣa"(AV. iii, 4.41).

As regards the identity texts which have jīva and Īśvara as their basic data, the jiva is established by sākṣi-pratyakṣa by perceiving the joys and sorrows of one's life though its own intuitive faculty, and Īśvara is established through the causal argument where one comes to know that Īśvara different from him as he hasn't got the powers of Īśvara. Thus, here the Upajīvya-pramāṇa conflicts or proves false the concept or interpretation of the identity between Īśvara and Jiva. So we have to accept the difference between Īśvara and Jiva as established by Upajīvya-pramāṇa. Hence, Madhva writes, "How can the sruti declare an identity (of Jīva and Brahman) which is in contradiction with the Upajīvyapramāṇa or basic proof of the sākṣi?".[19]

And at the end, Madhva holds, when there are seeming contradictions in śruti-texts regarding empirical and transempirical realities, the solution can only be found on the basis of sākṣi which is the ultimate source and guarantor of all knowledge and the touchstone of all truth and validity at all levels both empirical and transempirical. The interpretation of the identity texts when it is in clear conflict with saksi and upajīvya-pramāṇas cannot be held to mean the identity between jīva and Brahman, but it could merely describe the close intimacy of mystic communion of the

---

[19]. AV. p.29; B.N.K.Sharma, Teaching, p.63.

Rarest Archiver

human soul with God, for the evidence of Sākṣi-experience and Upajīvyapramāṇa are decidedly against Monism.[20]

2.21.METAPHYSICAL BASIS OF MADHVA'S THOUGHT.

The metaphysics of Madhva is explained under three aspects, namely: 1) Reality and Independence 2) Viśeṣa and Bhēda and 3) Causality. There is a philosophical distinction between the Independent real called Svatantra-tattva and the Dependent real called Paratantra-tattva. All the reals cannot be independent; if it is the case there can be strife and chaos in the world of reals. There should be an Independent principal that relates and regulates the dependent reals. It is the independent real that controls the dependents and not the dependents that control one another. The higher principle connects them all. Thus according to Madhva's metaphysics, there are the presence of many other things (reals) and persons as us; and there is the Independent principle namely God or Brahman that controls them all (Cf. BS. Bh.1, 2,17).

2.22.REALITY AND INDEPENDENCE:

Madhva's ontology turns upon the two principal ideas of being- reality and independence. The former presents the idea of reality expressed in space-time relations, pertaining to the world of matter and souls. The latter is the higher aspect of reality, which is characteristic of the divine alone. The criterion of reality according to Madhva is that it should be unsuperimposed and given as an object of valid knowledge, as existing at some point of time and in some place.[21]

The first criterion of reality should be that it is capable of being an object of valid knowledge that is called Pramitiviṣayatva. The second criterion of the reality is its relation to time and space that is called deśa-kāla-

---

[20]. B.N.K.Sharma, Teaching, p.74.
[21]. B.N. K. Sharma, Philosophy, p. 51.

Rarest Archiver

Sambandhitva. All that exists in time and space is real and the unreal has no existence in time and space. The practical efficiency (arthakriyakāritva) is the second test of reality for Madhva. It is the real alone that has the capacity to produces the effect. The cognition of the real silver produces the effect and not the unreal silver. Thus the criterion of the identification of the real is its fruitful activity. It can be illustrated through an example as to no one can produce vessels out of the illusory silver in the nacre. Though an illusory appearance of a snake in the rope is found to be producing certain reactions of fright or fear and the like, yet there is always a definite modicum of reality behind it according to Madhva (Cf. AV.1.4.11).

2.23.GRADATION OF REALITY:

The realities are divided into two broad categories in the ontological scheme of Madhvācārya: God or Brahman, the only Independent reality (svatantra tattva) and all other relities are dependent of God (paratantra tattva or parādhīnatatva), like Laksmi, Dēvas, souls and world of matter. This idea is also seen implied in the term Dvaita. Madhva expresses this in the following sentence: "There are two orders of reality namely- The Independent and the Dependent"(Cf. Svatantram asvatantram ca prameyam dvividham matam, TV.1).

Madhva accepts that existence is reality, yet he goes ahead recognizing the fact there must be something more than mere existence which is the highest expression of reality that must have metaphysical independence of being, powers, activities or substantiality as its own right. This is the highest real or the philosophical Absolute that is the ultimate explanation for all others. This is the Independent reality that is immanent in the universe and all other finite

Rarest Archiver

realities must draw their substance from this. It is in the Independent reality that all the finite realties are grounded and their being and becoming are realized in independent reality alone (Cf. BT, ii, 5,2; AV, ii, 2,5). This Independent reality (svatantra-tattva) is none other than Brahman or God, and He is described in the Vedanta as "Real of the reals-Satayasya satyam' and as the 'Eternal of the eternals'-Nityo Nityanam'. He is the source of all reality, consciousness, and activity in the finite reals.

The Dependent reals (paratantra) or finite realties are the world of matter and souls. The finite realities exist, know, and function only according to God's will. According to Madhva, the Jīva (soul) and Prakṛti (matter) are eternal but they exist and dependent on the grace of God and if that grace is withdrawn they come to nothing. The matter is insentient (jada) and it cannot act on its own accord and in the same manner, human souls are not independent existents, agents, and knowers. Madhva regards them in the philosophical sense as many 'Reflections'-pratibimba, images-Abasas of the Supreme Reality (bimba) as though all their powers are rooted and derived from the Supreme source (Brahman).

2.24.VIŚEṢA AND BHĒDA:

Padārtha or Category is anything that is named and about which an assertion or predication made. Dvaita recognizes ten metaphysical categories. They are: Substance (dravya), quality (guṇa), action (karma), universality (sāmānya), speciality (viśeṣa), the specified (viśiṣta), the whole (amsin), potency (śakti), similarity (sādrśya), and non-existence (abhāva). Of these first nine are positive categories (bhāva-padārtha). They constitute reality. The last is a negative category (abāva

Rarest Archiver

padārtha). Of the positive categories, substance is the substratum on which the remaining eight depend.[22]

Dvaita Vedānta considers and gives great importance to the category of 'specialty' (Viśeṣa) along with the concept of difference (bhēda). The category of bhēda (difference) signifies the individuality and the Viśeṣa (speciality) accounts for the inner unity of individual beings in Dvaita. Every substance necessarily possesses qualities. But qualities are incapable of existing by themselves. Hence, the relation between substance and quality is regarded as one of identity. But, although there is no actual difference between a substance and its attribute, common practice distinguishes between the two. Thus we think and speak of the whiteness of the cloth, and distinguish between cloth and its whiteness. This discrepancy is explained by means of the category of Viśeṣa. It is by virtue of visesa that substance and quality, which are identical, are spoken of as separate. Thus viśeṣa is another name for substance and stands for its wonderful capacity to show distinctions within itself.[23]

Madhva defines Viśeṣa in the following way: "speciality (viśeṣa) is that potency or factor (śakti) which enables one, undivided being to be described by different terms which are not synonymous among themselves. Such a factor, called speciality, exists in all things (AV.1.1. 109-110). Thus for example when we say that the soul is intelligent and it is endowed with being, we mean that the soul has two attributes of intelligent and being, by this it means that the soul is at once intelligent and being. Here the intelligent and existence are not synonymous but they don't even introduce the inner division into one reality that is the soul. According to

---

22. T.P. Ramachandran, Op.Cit., p.61)
23. Ibid., pp.65-66.

Rarest Archiver

Madhva, "though there is no difference in the reality, by virtue of viśeṣa the language of difference is rendered possible"(Cf. VTV. No.457).

Hence, the attributes are not completely distinct from the substance, if the attributes are completely distinct from the substance, then it will lead to the infinite regress. The attributes are neither completely identical with the substance, because such a view will make the substance-attribute relationship a meaningless one. Thus the speciality is the very nature of substance that exists with innumerable attributes and it is the cause of various predications. "Viśeṣa itself is a substantive essence and also lends itself to be spoken of as if it were different there from (VTV. No. 458).

The Viśeṣas bind together the different qualities of a substance into an internal inner unity, i.e., unity-in-difference between whole and the parts, between the agent and the action etc.

Viśeṣa is this "power of things in themselves" which, through an underlying identity of essence, enables us to distinguish 1). A particular from its universal; 2). A quality from its substance; 3). Motion or power or energy from things possessing them; 4). The svarupa from the svarupin and svarūpatvam.[24]

For Madhva, Viśeṣa is but another name for the potency of the thing in itself whereby it maintains its unity and continuity through all its modes, predications and aspects (Cf. Madhva commentary on Brh. Up. 1,4,9). In his Anuvyākya, Madhva maintains that the thing itself is so constituted that it can relate itself to and distinguish itself from its modes,

---

[24]. B.T. xi,7,49;Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, pp.40-41; B.N.K.Sharma Philosophy, p. 78.

Rarest Archiver

predicates or properties without invoking the aid of any other relation or a 'third entity' because of Viśeṣa(Cf. AV.ii,2,13).

Viśeṣa cannot be mistaken for new or additional attributes of things. If viśeṣa is different from the subject, it breaks its integrity. If it is non-different from it, we cannot call it viśeṣa.[25] B.N.K. Sharma, would hold that 'Viśeṣa' is thus, a category of thought or a power of things inherent in them which, by definition, is intended to justify and rationalize the difference-cum-identity. Thus the substance in its own power self-expresses in terms of subject-property relation called dharmadharmībhāva. So the viśeṣas has the function of both distinguishing and uniting the substance and the attributes in the philosophy of Madhva. He has thus made a striking effort to rise above the 'dualism' of substance and attributes and combine them into a homogeneous whole that admits, however, of logical, conceptual and linguistic distinction, wherever necessary, through the self-differentiation capacity of substances themselves, to be known as 'Viśeṣas' or relative particulars. Thus Madhva's contribution is very immense as regards his new and original solution to the problem of relation between substance and attributes.

2.25.BHĒDA (DIFFERENCE):

The Dvaita Vedānta maintains that difference or Bhēda characterizes the whole relam of reality. According to it, each substance is undivided in itself and is divided from all other substances. The term 'Dvaita' comes from the root 'Dvi' literally means two. Though Dvaita literally means two yet it implies that there is the difference (bhēda) between every two entities and strongest evidence to this is seen in the

---

[25]. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, Vol. II, (Bombay: Blackie & Son, 1983), p.746; B.N.K. Sharma, Philosophy, p.90; Ibid., p.73.

Rarest Archiver

perceptual experience. Thus things in the world are many and varied and they have among them both the quantitative and qualitative difference.

Madhva understands that the 'difference' is not merely a component part of reality, but constitutes its very nature or essence (VTV. No.122). To know a thing is to know it as it is distinct from all others. Generally some things are distinct from others and some in a particular way because the difference constitutes the very essence of things (dharmīsvarūpa); and it is not merely an attribute of them related from outside.

"If difference were not the nature of things, then, when an object is perceived, its distinction from all else (in a general way) would not be known. In that case, the perceiver himself might come to have a doubt whether he is his own self or the perceived object. But no one falls into such errors or doubts. This shows that difference is realized in the first perception of things, at least in a general way (VTV. No. 124-126). Therefore every thing is unique and each object has a its own nature. The uniqueness of each thing constitutes the difference from all other objects. The objects are entirely different from one another and two things cannot be alike. There are number of souls that limitless and the modifications of the matter are also numerous in many states. Therefore the metaphysics of Madhva is pluralistic.

The three major realities such as: God (Īśvara), Souls (Jīvas) and Matter (Jada) constitute the system of Madhva. These realities are conceived as the three distinct entities. There are two types of differences that exist in them. They are: 1. The difference of one thing from those of another kind (Sajātiya bhēda), 2.The difference from those of another kind (Vijātiya bhēda). Therefore we find the 'five-fold difference'

Rarest Archiver

called Panca-bhēda among those three major realities as: 1.Between God and Soul, 2.Between God and Matter, 3.Between Soul and Matter, 4.Between one Soul and Another and 5.Between one form of Matter and another. These differences among the realities are real, eternal and irreducible (Cf. VTV. No.340). The doctrine of five-fold difference (Panca-bhēda) is one of the cardinal tenets of Madhva's Dvaita metaphysics and this five-fold (Panca-bhēda) is collectively spoken of by Madhva as "Pra-panca"(Cf. VTV. No. 325).

2.26.CAUSATION (KĀRAṆATA):

Madhv's Pramāṇa-candrika, one of the most illuminating and the most authentic treatise on his logic, defines 'cause' as the unconditional, invariable antecedent of the effect. The 'effect' which is the counter-positive of negation prior to existence meaning that the 'effect' is that which does not exist before it caused to be (Ananyathasiddhatve sati karyaniyata pūrvavṛtti karaṇam kāryam pragabhāva pratiyōgi). Therefore we find there is some type of logical necessity in the relation between cause and effect. The condition of 'invariability' associated with the ides of 'cause' in its definition very well suggests the character of this relation as entailment or involving necessity. The Nyāya doctrine of asatkāryavāda asserts, even in cases of material-causality, that the 'effect' is absolutely non-existent in the 'cause'. But if it so, holds Dvaita Vedānta, then anything can be produced out of nothing, which is impossibility. On the other hand, it is also illogical to justify the Saṁkya claim that the effect always exists, though in a nascent form, in the cause prior to its manifestation (satkāryavāda) because by adopting this standpoint anything can be conceived as capable of being produced from anything without any limitations, whatsoever, regarding its nature. The Madhva philosopher,

Rarest Archiver

therefore, takes a middle course that contains all the virtues of the two antagonistic systems and rejects their inherent vices. The effect, according to Madhvites, is both existent as well as non-existent. Prior to its production the effect exists in the form of the cause and is non-existent as an 'effect', whereas, after its creation the 'effect' exists in its form as 'effect' and is non-existent as 'cause'. The cause and effect are, therefore, different aspects of the same principle.[26]

The causation theory that Madhva propounded is a combination of Sat-kārya-vāda (Pariṇāma vāda) of Saṅkya school and Asat-kārya-vāda(Ārambha-vāda_ of Nyāya school. Therefore his theory is called as Sat-Asat-Kārya-Vāda.

The implication of Causation is a change, a beginning and an end and by a change it does not mean merely something appearing but a Substratum is presupposed that changes in form or state (Ex nihilo nihil fit). Causation cannot be possible and meaningful without the assumption of continuity of the cause in and through the changes it has undergone. Therefore according to Dvaita, the effect was present already in the cause, as it has followed from the cause. Dvaita Vedānta does not accept the saṅkya view of the absolute identity of cause and effect because that may mean causal effect superfluous and the causation very meaningless. Again Dvaita also does not accept the Nyāya insistence on the total non-existence of effect prior to its production that will sunder the connection between the cause and effect. Therefore Madhva maintains that the effect is partially non-existent in its definite form and shape as it exists or while it is being existent in the form of the cause.

---

[26]. K.Narain, An outline of Madhva Philosophy,(Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal,1986), pp.71-72.

Rarest Archiver

Thus, the effect is existent in the cause in substance, but non-existent in it in its special form as a ring is present in gold as gold, but non-existent in it as a ring. Thus the relation between the material cause (gold) and its effect (ring) is 'identity and difference' (bhēdabhēda) and not absolute difference. The substance remains the same, but it puts forth-new forms, forms that are not already present in it. This is made possible by the presence of visesa (In respect of permanent attributes the relation is taken to be one of 'colorful identity' (saviśeṣabhēda) rather than absolute identity (nirviśeṣabhēda) which would make them tautologous. This clear and unequivocal stand has to be kept in mind in interpreting Madhva's doctrine of creation of eternal substances like jīva, prakṛti, avyakṛtākasá etc., in terms of what has been defined by Madhva as "Parādhīna-Viśeṣāpti".[27] That peculiar power of a substance to put forth variations from within its own structure. So the causation theory of Dvaita is called Viśeṣapti-the emergence (āpti) of new traits or Viśeṣas (features). Therefore Dvaita Vedānta would explain the origin of world as the emergence (āpti) from Matter (Prakṛti) of the newer and the newer forms (Viśeṣas). This emergence depends for its operation at its every stage only on the will of God and this world creation conception is called Paradhina viśeṣāpti in Dvaita Vedānta.

The Dvaita theory of Sad-asat-kārya-vāda is applicable only in the case of material causality (upādana-kāraṇa) and not instrumental causality (nimitta kāraṇa). Like other systems of Indian philosophy, the Madhva School also recognizes two kinds of causes, namely, the material cause (upādana-kāraṇa), and the instrumental cause (nimitta-kāraṇa).

---

[27]. B.N.K. Sharma. Philosophy, footnote, 7,p.72.

Rarest Archiver

The cause, which undergoes transformation, is known as material cause, i.e. the prakṛti as the cause of the universe. Here the material-cause (prakṛti or primordial matter) is transformed (pariṇāma) into the effect (universe). On the other hand, the 'instrumental-cause' is that which being an unconditional and invariable antecedent does not create its effect through a process of its transformation. The process of creating effect, in this case, is not self-modification but activity on the part of the 'Cause', which results in the production of the 'effect'. For Madhva these two causes are different. The material cause in the prakrti or primordial matter and the instrumental-cause is Viṣṇu. Viṣṇu as the efficient cause crates the world (universe) from the material-cause, the prakṛti. Hence, Madhva rejects the view of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja etc who consider Brahman as both the material and the instrumental cause.[28]

2.27.CRITICAL APPRECIATION OF MADHVA'S CONTRIBUTION:

The theory of 'perception and knowledge' is the philosophic foundation of Madhva's dualism. He holds that to perceive is to become aware of something as being unique and different (bhinna) from other things as well as from the self that perceives. Thus the articulation of perceived differences between things as well as between things and the perceiving self is the genuine knowledge. It is true that the limits of senses are the limits of knowledge. To deny perception is to deny the very possibility of knowledge. According to Madhva, those who affirm the identity but deny the difference are in the absurd position of claiming knowledge by rejecting its very foundation, which means perception and perception necessarily implies the perceiver and the perceived as

---

[28]. K.Narain Op.cit. p.72-73.

Rarest Archiver

distinct existents. Madhva like any empirical philosopher holds that all knowledge is relative i.e. relative to some knower and to things that are known. He rejects the non-dual knowledge as untenable. Thus we see in him as the epistemological and the ontological realist. In reality the world is constituted of different selves and material objects besides we perceive it to be so. Therefore the empirical world is real and pluralistic for Madhva.[29]

Madhva's comprehensive definition of 'pramāṇa' and its clear distinction into 'Kēvala' and 'Aṇu' and, above all, his conception of Sākṣi as the ultimate criterion of all knowledge and validity are front-rank contributions to epistemology. His greatest contribution to epistemology is the doctrine of Sākṣin that alone is the criterion of all knowledge and validity. To put it in the words of B.N.K Sharma, Madhva has thus gone far ahead of his contemporaries and compeers in having postulated a new principle of truth-determination in epistemology in the form of Sākṣi, as the ultimate criterion of truth which is infallible and intrinsically valid. Its raison d'etre are (1) that it alone can be the ultimate guarantor of the validity of all other Pramāṇas (as it is the last word on validation, not only of ordinary experiences, senses-perception and inference, but even of the teachings of the scripture), (2) that it is the logical fulfillment and culmination of any really self-complete theory of knowledge and (3) that it is the only means of intuitive perception of certain super sensuous categories like Time, Space, the nature of the self and its attributes, the and the mind and its modes, all knowledge of pleasure and pain etc.

---

29. Puligandla, Foundations of Indian philosophy, pp.237-238.

Rarest Archiver

Therefore,"there is nothing approaching it in any other system of Indian philosophy.

It remains Madhva's unique contribution to the theory of knowledge. Its repercussions on realism in modern thought are sure to be fruitful, if properly exploited.[30]

Ontologically speaking, the keynote of Madhva's philosophy has always been the acceptance of the ONE INDEPENDENT REAL as the "Parasiddhānta" and all the rest as of secondary importance (Cf. MGBii.24). What we see in Madhva is, he is original in his ontological theory of Svatantra and Paratantra entities and his philosophical ideology of a Svatantra Advitiya Brahman. By applying the doctrine of Saviśeṣabhēda to Brahman Madhva preserved its complete homogeneity without sacrificing the infinite richness of its qualitative content thereby introducing a more dynamic, colorful conception of Brahman through the doctrine of identity-in-difference, *for the first time of Indian thought.* His theory of "Viśeṣa" is the life-breath of the doctrine of identity-in-difference. Without it, it would be impossible to conceive of an identity-in-difference, *in any school of thought ancient or modern.* Since no other school has accepted "Viśeṣa", the credit for the philosophical conception of "identity-in-difference" should also go to Madhva. This theory of Viśeṣas is his most outstanding contribution to the stock of philosophical ideas in Indian thought. Its elasticity and resilience to admit of internal distinctions of reference, without the disadvantage of "difference" "difference-cum-identity", "Samavāya" or "fictitious difference" (*kālpanikabhēda*), through the inner resources of the substance itself, replaces many worn-out and outmoded conceptions of

---

30. B.N.K.Sharma philosophy, pp.45, 169.

Rarest Archiver

time, space, causation and creation by more satisfactory ones. This is no small contribution to thought.[31]

2.28.GOD OR BRAHMAN IN MADHVĀCĀRYA:

The problem of the existence of God was not a posited problem in the Hindu tradition of the Middle Ages. We do not come across the question in the writings of Madhva as: Is there an Absolute Being? The contemporaries of Madhva took for granted the existence of God just relying on the 'Sacred texts'.

The hotly debated issue during the time of Madhva was regarding the 'Knowledgebility of God' or through which pramāṇas or means of knowledge we can come to know the Absolute Being? It was because, Nayayikas had maintained that God is known through reasoning or inference alone, and the Vedāntins asserted that the Absolute could be known through the sacred texts (revelation).

According to Madhva, "God is the Independent Being possesssed of all adequate and unrestricted power in regard to the Cit and Acit and who is all-knowing. He is the One who controls the cit and Acit (sentient and insentient reals) which are of a different nature from him"(TD. P. 66). This gives a neat and pithy definition of God. Cit and Acit are unlike God in that they are of limited powers, dependent and not all- knowing. "The Independent Being must, necessarily, be infinite in Its attributes (N.V. p.4). For, an Independent Being cannot possibly wish to be finite and limited in any sense".[32]

2.28.1.VIṢṆU IS KNOWABLE:

Madhva says, "I offer adoration always to Narāyaṇa, who is cognizable in all his uniqueness only through the right

---

31. Ibid.,pp.44-45.
32. N.V. p.4, B.N.K.Sharma Teaching, p.110.

Rarest Archiver

scriptures, who wholly transcends the Kṣāra and the akṣara and who is flawless and abounds in all excellent attributes (Kṣāra means 'Individual selves, 2.Akṣara is Laksmi his divine consort. His transcendece of both Laksmi and the individual selves implies a fortiori his transcendence of inanimate nature.[33]

"Viṣṇu whom all names enter is said to be supreme. All names refer to him who is different from all. He, who is independent and eternally same, is the highest Viṣṇu. In such texts, as all other names signify only him, it is pointed out that no other being can be the Lord of all. The Paramopaniṣad says: 'That Viṣṇu who is free from all imperfection, who is an embodiment of all auspicious attributes, who is independent and under whose control everything else is, is the supreme Godhead.[34]

"Viṣṇu can only be known through the Sacred Texts and by the devotees alone"(B.S. Bh.1.i.3). Madhva would maintain that he who is ignorant of Vēdas cannot understand the great Viṣṇu and sacred texts alone teach about the knowable of Supreme Being. If one asserts that the Absolute Being is unknowable, then implicitly he denies that Brahman is real. The very first sutra of Brhama-Sūtra enjoins an enquiery into Brahman and takes it for granted that Brahman is knowable.

Again "reason will not be able to prove the existence of God. It can always be countered by other reasons. If one should prove God to be all knowing, another could as well reason that He must be of limited knowledge, like any other individual. A creator God need not necessarily be knowing each and every creature; just as a gardener does not know all about

---

33. S.S. Rāghavacār, VTV. No.1, Cf. Brahmasūtrabhāṣya, 1.i. I- B. S. Bh. VTV.Rāghavacār, p.1.
34. S.S. Rāghavacār,VTV, Nos.451, 454, pp.93-94.

Rarest Archiver

the trees and plants in his garden. All theistic proofs are thus inclusive and vagarious.[35] Thus Madhva would strongly maintain that 'Viṣṇu is an object of our knowledge or knowable though He can never be fully comprehended. He fully rejects the agnostic position as it contradicts the very nature of reality and knowledge and opposes the Vēdic testimony.

2.28.2.VIṢṆU IS NOT KNOWN BY PERCEPTION (PRATYAKṢA-JÑĀNA):

It is through the contact of the senses with the object, the perception (Pratyakṣa-Jñāna) arises; and such sense object is limited to the sphere of the sensible. The Absolute Being (Brahman) stands beyond the sphere of the sensible and out side the domain of the individual self, therefore It cannot be reached by any perception of the senses.

In his Viṣṇu-Tava-Vinīrṇaya, No.3, Madhva writes as: "Viṣṇu cannot be apprehended by mere reasoning or by sensuous perception and not by one devoid of the qualifications specified. He can be apprehended only through the scriptures and only devotees. There is no other way.[36]

2.28.3.REASONING AND OUR KNOWLEDGE OF VIṢṆU.

The common assertion of Madhva is that 'Viṣṇu cannot be apprehended by mere reason as it is mentioned in Viṣṇu-tava-vinīrṇaya (Cf. VTV. No. 3, Raghavacār, p.2). Here, like a true Vedāntin, Madhva challenges the power of unaided human reason to prove the existence and nature of God. This does not mean that reason is futile. All vedāntins have waxed eloquent on the futility of reason to establish God. Philosophers in the West too, have adduced various proofs like the ontological proof, the cosmological proof and so forth which have all been

---

35. A.V. p.5, B.N.K.Sharma Teachings, p.110.
36. S.S.Rāghavacār VTV. No 3,p.2.

Rarest Archiver

criticized by other philosophers like Kant. The limitations of reason and the claims of intuition have been loudly proclaimed. Since reason holds an important position even in the interpretation of Śrutis, what is meant by this is that it is beyond the power of reason to make the existence of the divine anything more than a very reasonable presumption and hypothesis. It could suggest very strongly to all thinking men that there must be a God that adduces fairly sound reasons in its support, which cannot be easily dislodged. There it must stop. It cannot give us fullness of details about the nature of God, and of His infinite attributes and powers and personality: Yavan yascasmi tattvataḥ as the Gīta (18,55) so impressively puts it. That is left to the Śruti to give us complete and convincing knowledge in detail about the Supreme (asamasayam samagram, as the Gīta (vii,1.) so aptly puts it). Madhva concedes that reason can go thus far when he describes how the idea of God is formed in our minds: ita idam adhikam itopidam iti sarvadhikatvena, tato adhikabhāvena, avaśeṣitatvēna...(B.T. x. p.71). "Reason also can be adduced to show that Brahman should be conceived as Saguṇa. It should possess attributes like omniscience insofar as it is the creator of everything in the universe. Creatorship presupposes full knowledge of the effect to be, its accessories, nature of effort, the expected result, and the putting forth of necessary will and effort to accomplish the work. It follows that the all-creator must be all knowing, all powerful and capable of accomplishing whatever He will. This is what "Saguaṇa" stands for.[37] Dvaitins also accept the Vēdic teaching (Śruti) that 'He who ignores the Sacred texts cannot know Viṣṇu'.

---

[37]. K.N.p.10b, B.N.K.Sharma Teachings, pp. 111-112,118.

Rarest Archiver

Madhva refutes the Saṅkhya and Cārvaka views on the production of the Universe, the principles of causality and order in the world and strongly maintains that the unconscious matter could not have been the cause of the world (Cf. B.S. Bh. II .ii; Tattvadīpika, p. 195). And again he holds that dependent and limited souls could not have produced the world and the contingent beings could never be the first cause (Cf. B. S. Bh. II.i.25).

The whole of human activity or striving is towards the supreme Good, the excellent, the unconditioned. The Dvaita attitude to reasoning and revelation and the respective relation of these two sources of knowledge as regards our knowledge of God may be seen from the analysis of Kārya; the notion of kārya means either that which is desired (the end or object of our desire) or the means or the action to reach the desired end- the - supreme Good-God. Thus the inner dynamism of our activity can be made as a valid proof God's existence.

2.28.4.REFUTATION OF THE PROOFS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD:

Madhva strongly maintains that 'Reason will not be able to prove the existence of God [38] or His existence cannot be proved by inference, because the opposite also can be proved by inference.[39] Again Madhva writes: " An Independent inference that is, an inference not aided by Śruti, cannot prove the existence of God, because using the same method and with the same necessity one can show that the being (cause) in question is only human and not God. Reasoning is not capable of reaching the Lord of the universe (Cf. Av. No. 114).

According to Nyāya this world as a product must have a cause and that cause is God. But Madhva on the other hand implicitly limits the principle of causality to the verifiable

---

38. A.V.p.5, Sharma, Teachings, p.5;
39. S.S.Rāghavacār, VTV. No.62, p.14.

Rarest Archiver

sensible realities' sphere. For him, we should not transfer the cause-effect relationship to the super-sensible -God. Certainly Madhva admits that every effect has a cause, but he would question as to 'can we truly prove that the whole world is an effect? Madhva dismisses the proposition that the world calls for an omniscient cause, and such proposition is invalid. He holds that the cause of the world knows the world, but the cause is omniscient is not proved. Now therefore we clearly understand that Madhva's Vaiṣṇava Vedāntic tradition and his much conviction as 'Viṣṇu alone is the supreme Lord' has prevented him from showing any sympathy to the rational proofs regarding the Cause and effect.

2.28.5.THE NATURE OF GOD:

The enquiery of Madhva into the problem of God is sacred-text-centered (śruti), and his conviction is that Śruti alone can give us the knowledge of Supreme Being. Therefore according to him, it is through the Śruti, we should approach into the inner mystery of God. But as far as the Supreme Being is concerned, the sacred texts can never be independent sources of knowledge.

2.28.6.THE ONENESS OF GOD:

Madhva teaches that the whole of true sacred scripture-sadāgama (śruti) and Smṛti(secondary accounts) speak and teach of only Supreme or Absolute Being-God. This Supreme Being is Viṣṇu, who is identical with Brahman. "Viṣṇu whom all names enter, is said to be Supreme. All names refer to him who is different from all. He, who is independent and eternally same, is the highest Viṣṇu. In such texts, as all other names signify only him, it is pointed out that no other being can be the Lord of all. All this follows from the fact that in all the Vedas there is the assertion that Viṣṇu is free from

Rarest Archiver

imperfections, that in all of them there is the non-existence of the statement that he was non-existent before creation, that in all the Vēdas the defects and the non-existence before creation of all other entities are asserted and that they are not said to be the significance of all names.[40]

The sacred texts teach that Viṣṇu is the abode of all good qualities and nowhere in śruti a reference is made of a distinction between an attributeless Brahman and a Brahman with qualities. Thus Madhva writes: "It is wrong to say that one and the same Brahman is said to be endowed with qualities of producing the world, of being seen and exposed when a soul is in the state of ignorance, though in a state of knowledge, Brahman is said to be attributeless, unseen and inexpressible (Tattvadīpika, pp.40-43).

Madhva strongly asserts that Supreme Being (God) is the cause of the origin, support and destruction of this entire universe (world). And through this definition it is implicitly affirmed that Viṣṇu alone and not another being is the cause of this world. He declares that Viṣṇu alone is the cause of the world. Madhva fully believes and it is self-evident to him that Viṣṇu is omniscient, luminous and He in no way is veiled by Māyā, a light and darkness cannot exist together is self evident. "How can the Supreme Brahman remain primarily Infinite (Pūrna) if it were to be limited by Māyā".[41]

2.28.7. THE BODY OF VIṢṆU:

Now what Madhva wants to justify is that 'Viṣṇu is the cause of this universe and he must have a body. The Sacred texts tell us that Viṣṇu has body. Madhva removes the material bodies from Viṣṇu and holds that Lord Viṣṇu is different from matter (Cf. Bh.III. ii.15). According to him Viṣṇu pervades

---

40. S.S. Rāghavacār, VTV. Nos. 451-452,p.93.
41. A.V. p.5, Sharma Teachings, p. 116.

Rarest Archiver

over matter and He is the inner principle of the activity of matter. The word 'body' usually means that it comes from the union of male and female principle. As regards to Viṣṇu, it is better to say that He has no body (Cf. Jayatīrtha on B.S. Bh. III.iii.14-15).

Here we have to concentrate on the 'Othereness' (from matter) of the body of Viṣṇu. Viṣṇu is not subject to birth or death, change or decay like us. In his Anuvyākhāyana, Madhva positively means that the body of Viṣṇu consists in nothing but His attributes as: "Nārāyaṇa, whose body is nothing but the totality of his attributes (A.V. I.I). He also says that the head, arms and trunk of Viṣṇu are made out of being, knowledge and Ānanda (bliss)(Cf. B.S. Bh. II.ii.4).

Madhva denies the teaching that the spiritual souls and matter that form the body of the Supreme Being. According to him only the infinite attribute of the Lord Viṣṇu form His body. The attributes, the members are not distinct from one another or the Supreme Being. The souls and matter depend on God and He is the indwelling principle of all these realities and these realities do not form the body of Viṣṇu.

2.28.8.VIṢṆU THE OCEAN OF ATTRIBUTES:

Madhva's one of the loved words is 'Pūrna' in all his writings. The Paramōpaniṣad says:" That Viṣṇu who is free from all imperfections, who is an embodiment of all auspicious attributes, who is independent and under whose control everything else is, is the Supreme God head". And again " He has all excellent attributes in all their fullness eternally. He is always free from imperfections. That Supreme Viṣṇu is independent and transcends birth and death.[42] Thus according to Madhva the Supreme Viṣṇu is the fullness, the ocean of good

---

42. S.S.Rāgavachār, VTV. Nos.454-455, p.94.

Rarest Archiver

qualities and He is has no defects all. Thus in the view of Madhva, every word and varṇa of the Sacred text primarily mean the Supreme Lord Viṣṇu and his qualities (Sarvanāmata).

Though there are certain statements in the sacred texts that term Brahman as Kēval, simple and Nirguṇa (without attributes), Madhva holds that such words do not intent to teach the qualitylessness of the Supreme Being. The term 'Kēvala means here that Viṣṇu is not mixed with matter (Kēvalo vimisraḥ) and according to the sacred texts, 'Nirguṇa' Brahman means that Viṣṇu is devoid of all material qualities such as sattva and rājas.

Our experiences show us that every object is individual, particual and is endowed with attributes. Thus it is clear that the infinite Viṣṇu should also be endowed with infinite qualities, and the purport of the sacred texts is that the Absolute Being has attributes. Madhva propagates that, one of the essential traits of the Supreme Lord Viṣṇu is his independence (Svatantrya) and because of this independence and power of God, we can argue that He is without defects and has many attributes. Therefore Madhva would declare: "It is impossible to enumerate or speak of qualities of the Lord for they are innumerable; all the qualities declared or undeclared in Śruti are found in him (B.S Bh. II.i.38). "The attributes and actions of Brahman are the same as itself. They are different. There is no mutual difference, either, among them. There is an intrinsic peculiarity in things (called viśeṣas) by which, even in the absence of actual difference, a relation of 'substance and attributes' is rendered possible for purposes of reference"[43]

2.28.9.VIṢṆU IS SAT:

---

43. V.T.N. p.31, Sharma Teachings, p.120.

Rarest Archiver

Madhva, commenting on Brahma Sūtra(B.S. I.i.15) in his Anuvyākhyāna, teaches that 'Viṣṇu alone is designated by the mantravarṇa as Satyam, Jñānam and Anantam. Madhva calls Viṣṇu as 'Sat' (Existence) because he alone causes existence and the existences is called sadbhāva. Here, probably Madhva means to say that Viṣṇu causes the appearances of reaities or the manifestation of the realities in the universe.

In the writings of Anuvyākhyāna, Madhva holds that 'sat' stands for the principle of life and of destruction. For him, the Supreme Being is not merely alive but also he causes life. Thus the term 'sat' is applied functionally to Viṣṇu; He exists, He is alive, He causes other things to appear. And it is on Viṣṇu alone all things are dependent for their existence; and the supreme Lord Viṣṇu alone causes both life and destruction.

2.28.10.VIJÑĀNA OF VIṢṆU:

The sacred texts clearly teach this truth that Viṣṇu is omniscient (having infinite knowledge) and 'Sarvajña' is an epithet given to the Lord Viṣṇu. Viṣṇu is the conscious and omniscient, from the fact that he is the cause of this universe. Therefore the form of this Supreme Being is that of unmixed knowledge (najñānamiśrajñāneḥ (Cf. B.S. Bh. II. Ii. 41; III.ii.16). We come to know the knowledge of the Supreme Being as eternal, embracing the totality of beings and totally independent in the Pramāṇalakṣaṇa. All other realities or beings only know only through their dependency on Viṣṇu. The knowledge of the supreme Lord is creative in the world. Because the world is produced by the knowledge of the Lord Viṣṇu, it is called māyāmaya (Prajñāvinirmitaḥ yasmat ato māyāmayam jagat, Viṣṇutattva vinirṇaya.[44]

---

[44]. S.S.Rāghavavacār,VTV. No.263,p.57.

Rarest Archiver

2.28.11.ĀNANDA OF VIṢṆU:

The supreme Lord Viṣṇu is rightly called as 'endless (ananta), because Viṣṇu is the fullness of bliss(Ānanada) and He is said to be plentitude of joy(AV. 197. B.S. Bh. I.iii.9, Tattvadīpika, p.116). Viṣṇu has the limitless bliss, and the terms such as " Pūrnatva", "nihsimatva" and " Mahātmaya" etc, express his greatness, perfection, supremacy and infinitude etc. The supreme Viṣṇu alone is called 'ānandamaya' because He is the abundance of bliss (ānanda) (Cf. AV. 179; B.S Bh.I.i.13). Here the suffix 'Māyā" expresses the nature of reality. Thus when we say that Viṣṇu is ānandamaya, here it means that he has the nature of 'bliss' and bliss is the characteristic of Viṣṇu. So it is said that all other beings from Śrī to the least blade of grass enjoy only a drop of bliss (B.S. Bh. I.ii.15). At the root of Viṣṇu's activity, his bliss overflows.

2.28.12.AIŚVARYA OF VIṢṆU:

In the Pancarātra (samhitās), the aiśvarya (Lordship) of Viṣṇu is spoken, because of this quality, Viṣṇu produces the world independently of all other causes. Besides this meaning as aiśvarya (Lordship) Madhva has other new significance to it. In the sacred tests we read Viṣṇu is at once a unity (a whole) and members, and He is minute and great. These attributes though opposed to each other in our experience, are not mutually exclusive in Viṣṇu, it is because of his aiśvarya or Lordship. According to Madhva, the aiśvarya of Viṣṇu enables him to be active and yet unchangeable.

Viṣṇu's omnipotence is also connected with his Lordship, and he known as Sarvaśaktiman, acintyaśaktiman, and Vicitraśaktiman. The power of Viṣṇu is all embracing, varied

Rarest Archiver

and unthinkable. Also Viṣṇu with his 'bala' produces the world without fatigue.

2.28.13.VIṢṆU IS NITYA(ETERNAL):

Viṣṇu is eternal of eternals (Katha. V.5-13). Viṣṇu is beginningless and endless. Madhva says in the Katha Up. Bh. 'that the world is eternal like an ever flowing stream (pravāhanitya) but Viṣṇu is deathless (Amṛtaḥ. P.19). He alone is primarily deathless. Viṣṇu is taught as the beginningless, endless and unchangeable in his existence. Just as the same sun is present in many objects so also Viṣṇu is Omnipresent by one and the same form (Cf. B.S. Bh. II.iii, 22,23). This type of omnipresent is possible because of his Lordship. He said to be the indwelling principle of all beings, the ruler of all and the principle agent of all activities. The Lord Viṣṇu is also present even in the deepest hell, though by no means he suffers the pain of hell (B.S. Bh. III.i.7), and again he is present in all beings and all beings are in Viṣṇu (Cf. Īś.Up.Bh. 1&5).

2.28.14.VIṢṆU IS SVATANTRA- INDEPENDENT REALITY:

Madhva maintains that Viṣṇu is the abode of all auspicious attributes. His Independence or freedom is the most divine of all perfections and the perfection that sets him apart from all other beings. Madhva divides realities into two irreducible groups in his Tattvasaṅkhyāna as: 1.Independent 2. Dependent beings. Viṣṇu alone is said to be independent being and all other relities are dependent of Viṣṇu. Viṣṇu is independent or svatantrya, as regards his essential nature, knowledge and activity are concerned; and again as Independent being Viṣṇu is not dependent on another as regards his existence (satta) activity and knowledge are also concerned. Thus it is clear in Madhvaa, that Viṣṇu is self-sufficient

Rarest Archiver

because of his existence, knowledge and activities. Viṣṇu never originates which means that He does not pass from an unmanifest state to a manifest form. He is said to be always real and self-manifest. The actualizing source, the source from which knowledge springs must be found or sought in Viṣṇu alone.

It is because of his independence, Viṣṇu is self-sufficient, Absolute, essential sovereign, has omnipotence, will, has total control over all other realities. He is perfectly separated and transcends all other realities in the universe. Viṣṇu has the total independence, and because of this he is the cause of he world and is the principle cause of all the activities of finite beings (Cf. Bh. G. Bh. II. 24. IV. 12). The liberated as well as the lost souls experience the absolute sovereignty of the Lord Viṣṇu. Lord Viṣṇu is supremely free and he gives final freedom to souls because no conditioned or unfree being can give freedom to any of the realities.

2.28.15.PERFECTIONS: SIMILARITY AND DEFFERENCE:

Madhva more anxiously points out the difference between Viṣṇu, and other beings with their perfections. Through numerical and quantitative expressions Madhva stresses the absolute perfection of Viṣṇu. According to the Upaniṣadic teaching, there is a difference between the knowledge of a soul and the knowledge of the Supreme Being. It is through a drop of the bliss of Brahman, all other beings live. Thus it is clear from the teachings of the sacred tests (śruti) that the perfections of the Supreme Being is far superior (para) and different from those of other beings. The attributes of the supreme God form the support, the sustenance, and the regulating source of the attributes of all creatures

Rarest Archiver

(Tattvadīpika). Though the perfections of other beings are perceptible, the limitless attributes of Visnu are invisible.

2.28.16.INNER SIMPLICITY OF VIṢṆU AND THE MULTIPLICITY OF PERFECTIONS:

It is clear that the attributes of Viṣṇu do not in any way introduce real separation or division in the substance of Viṣṇu and there can be by virtue of them the possibility of the language of difference. Thus each attribute is an expression of Viṣṇu's essential nature. The attributes and nature are essentially with Viṣṇu. Though there are many attributes in Viṣṇu yet there is also oneness and harmony among all the attributers of Viṣṇu.

The substance-attribute relation is also applicable to all the entities in the world. Though the Lord Viṣṇu is endowed with numberless perfections, still he is said to be without any inner difference or distinction and this is very specific to him. According to Madhva, the supreme Lord Viṣṇu is One and Simple, yet in diversity, his simplicity and unity find their dynamic expression. Viṣṇu's infinite perfections form one harmonious unity and each of his attributes is related to him by **saviśeṣa-abhēda's** relation and each attribute has for essence all other attributes and each of attributes possesses Viṣṇu's divine infinitude.

2.28.17.VIṢṆU IS THE CAUSE OF THE ORIGIN, SUPPORT AND DESTRUCTION OF THE WORLD(UNIVERSE):

Madhva follows the Vaiṣṇava-Vedānta tradition and affirmes strongly that Viṣṇu alone is the Cause, support, Dissolution of the world, and this we come to know through the teaching of the sacred texts (śruti). The origination of the world, support, dissolution, government, knowledge, ignorance, bondage and souls (jīvas) are from Lord Viṣṇu. Madhva proves

Rarest Archiver

his theocentrism thought from quoting the passages from the sacred texts (śruti).

2.28.18.REFUTATION OF OPPOSING VIEWS:

At the time of the growth of Madhva philosophy, there were diverse schools of thought which affirmed that Viṣṇu was not the cause and origin of the world. According to atheistic Śaṅkhya philosophy, 'Prakṛti' alone and of the mere presence of Puruṣa the world came to be". The materialists held that the world comes into existence by the varied combinations of the atoms. The Budhists or śūnyavādins propagated that the world results from void or Sūnaya; and according Vijñānavādins assertions', the universe exists because of the modification of vijñāna. According Śaivaites, Śiva is said to be the cause of the universe. The Śaktas held that the world originated from Śakti. Madhva speaks about all these views of the schools of thought in his Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya and he refutes them all one by one.

Madhva sees this world as an 'ordered' and 'purposeful thing'; thus the producer of such a world must be endowed with knowledge. Therefore be it Prakṛti or the atoms of the various elements, they cannot in themselves be the cause for the existence of this universe. The author of this world is endowed with knowledge, omnipotence, and independence. Therefore no finite beings or souls can be the cause of this universe.

2.28.19.VIṢṆU IS ONLY THE EFFICIENT CAUSE OF THE WORLD:

According to Madhva, Viṣṇu cannot be the upādanakaraṇa (parts) of this world and he openly and explicitly holds on to this view. He maintains that change is possible only where there is (inner) division; our experiences testify to the fact that the changeable entities are divided. But Viṣṇu is

Rarest Archiver

unchangeable because he is undivided or he has no parts - if he is in parts then he is imperfect (Cf. B.S. Bh. II.iii,7). And again change means a type of dependence. The supreme Lord Viṣṇu is totally and unconditionally independent and therefore he is not changeable. But it is in the nature of God that the unchangeable Lord Viṣṇu effects the changeable realities. Lord Viṣṇu is the power in all beings who is endowed with power, yet he himself is with no parts (Cf. B.S. Bh. II.iii.9).

If Viṣṇu is the material supportive cause of this universe then such a cause He is necessarily subjected to change. Madhva clarifies the point that the material world could not have come from Viṣṇu, because a non-conscious being (material being) can never be the evolutes of a conscious being who is Viṣṇu. His understanding is that there is the great gulf between spirit and matter so it is impossible for a spirit to evolve in to a material being that is this world.

Madhva strongly teaches that the universe is real and it is not illusory reality at all. Brahman is the real producer of this universe. As regards the magic and an illusory activity, Madhva propagates that only impotent beings, incapable of producing real effects take recourse to magic and other illusory activities. Viṣṇu is the supreme real and He does not need magic or yogic power. So the Brahmavivartavāda is also rejected.

2.29.ORIGINATION OF THE WORLD:

According to Madhva, souls, matter, time, space, and certain other realities are eternal and also they are coeval (lasting for the same period of time), with the supreme Viṣṇu; and again these realities are eternally dependent of Viṣṇu. The substance, karma, time, the essential nature of a being and soul (jīva) all these exist through the favor of Viṣṇu, and in the absence of Viṣṇu these realities do not exist. The

Rarest Archiver

above mentioned concepts are found in Bhāgavata and Purāṇa, and Madhva quotes them very often.

Madhva never says that Viṣṇu causes all the beings to exist. What he means is that the real origin of the universe means Sṛsti of everything as a result of the evolution of Prakṛti and of the union of souls with bodies in the world; and all these happen because of the supreme Lord. Viṣṇu does not produce the realities out of nothing. Already existing realities acquire the new state of being, a change in the dependence on the will of another (parādhīnaviśēṣāpti). All the eternal realties are eternally dependent on Viṣṇu who is their Satta. Madhva holds that dependence of these realties on Viṣṇu is not thought to be causation.

2.29.1.VIṢṆU IS THE SUPPORTER AND RULER OF THE WORLD:

Often Madhva uses a sort of formula in his writings that Viṣṇu, the Supreme Lord is only source of the origin, support, government, destruction of the world and of ignorance, bondage and liberation of jīvaṣ (souls). Jayatīrtha comments on the VTV saying "concerning souls, origination signifies the production of the body, sthiti means the permanence of the soul in the bodily state, niyati-government stands for the binding of the soul by means of injunctions and prohibitions. As regards the immortal gods, their origin consists in their appearance, their sthiti in the absence of death, their niyati in their subordination to the commands of Viṣṇu"(VTV. Tika, 342-3).

The supreme Lord exercises the supporting causality (dharakatva) so that he keeps all manifest realities in that state. Here the Lord supporting this world seem to mean the permanence of the world in its manifest state. The Lord is imperishable, as imperishable Lord he supports all beings by being present in them in many ways. If Viṣṇu does not wish to support the world, then he puts it down and it disappears. It

Rarest Archiver

is the command of the Lord that supports all things; and it is the independent and omnipotent will of Viṣṇu that is the source and support of all the realities in the universe.

According to Madhva, Viṣṇu is present in all beings and not merely in general manner. He strongly teaches that the Lord Viṣṇu is present in the heart and at the root of the hearing faculty; he is present in the eye and all the senses also. All those people endowed with real knowledge know that all their actions and actions in the universe are from the Lord Viṣṇu. Madhva maintains that at the command of the Lord Viṣṇu each being, and even each faculty has a presiding deity; and these deities are also the instruments in the hands of Viṣṇu for the support and government of the universe. Madhva follows the Vedāntic tradition and holds that the Brahman is the cause of the destruction of the manifest world.

2.29.2.PURPOSE OF CREATION:

Madhva propagates that, 'Viṣṇu is the Absolute Bliss (ānanda) and his desires are eternally fulfilled. Thus Viṣṇu, from his work of producing the world does not derive any profit or utility. But no intelligent being does anything without a purpose. Therefore we can legitimately ask aquestion as "what is the motive of Viṣṇu in creating the world? To this Madhva would answer 'Īśvara engages in the work of creating the world out of play (līla) and not for the sake of gaining any particle of profit (B.S.Bh. II.i.33,34). The play of Lord Viṣṇu is rooted in his bliss. Therefore according to Madhva, this world is originated from the bliss of Viṣṇu; and the Lord's play is an overflow of divine bliss. But here it should be borne in mind that the Lord is not in need of play and he does not derive some pleasure from such a play or līla. The Lord is free; therefore he acts freely because of his blissful nature and his creative act is nothing more than an act of his

Rarest Archiver

will (Av.II.i.108). What Madhva is trying to tell us is that God is the reason for creation; and no extrinsic motive determines the Lord to produce this universe. Madhva understands that, Viṣṇu intends the liberation of the good beings and damnation of the wicked ones.

2.29.3.CREATION AND USE OF SĀDHANAS:

The sacred texts (śruti) teach us that the Lord Viṣṇu uses various means like Prakṛti, space, and time in his work of creation; and God creates human beings in accordance to their Karma. Though Viṣṇu makes use of these means or instruments (Prakṛti, space, and time) in his creative work, their power to be means or instruments come from him alone and from his will to use them (Cf.B.S. Bh.ii.39, Svecchaniyam, Av.II.92). As it is already mentioned above the Lord Viṣṇu is free and his freedom is such that he could have created the universe with or without these instruments (Av. 94). For example, as a man though he is capable of walking on foot with no aid uses a stick to lean on out of sport, so also the Lord uses Prakṛti as the material cause of the world (Cf. Bh. G. Bh. I , 8).

It is by the very fact that Viṣṇu uses many means and instruments in his work of creation, he manifests his glory and majesty. Karma does not bind Viṣṇu as it binds other dependent beings; and it depends on the Supreme Viṣṇu for its existence. The supreme Viṣṇu takes the Karma of the souls (jīvas) into consideration while creating the universe. According to Dvaita Vedānta, Karma exists under the sovereign will of the Lord (Nyāya Sudha. II.i.37).

Madhva uses the 'Svatantraya' of Viṣṇu as a key to the solution of these problems such as; the actual origin of the world, the motive of creation, God's use of instruments in the work of producing the Universe etc. Madhva takes up many

Rarest Archiver

cosmogenic myths that are found in sacred tests (śruti) and interprets them according to his faith in Viṣṇu in his commentaries. When Madhva holds that Viṣṇu alone is the Lord and God, this type of the process of Vaiṣṇavaisation is unavoidable. Madhva starts from the Sańkhya system to explain the principle theory of the process of the world origination and evolution; and he changes the Sańkhya ideas very radically. He maintains that Prakṛti is only the material cause of the universe and the ultimate cause of everything is the supreme Viṣṇu alone. At the command of Viṣṇu Prakṛti evolves into various stages; and the matter and spirit come together for their existence.

2.29.4.ĀNANDA- LILA OF VIṢṆU:

The purpose of the production of this world is God's ananda-līla. But for the finite spirits, creation means as the liberation of the good souls and damnation of the wicked ones. Madhva also accepts the existence of evil, suffering, pain, and sin in the world; and the explanation for the existence of evil should be sought in the karma principle. Karma itself totally dependent of the Lord Viṣṇu and he is present and active in every being; therefore we must look for a deeper reason for the existence of evil. Can the svarūpa-bhēda of finite spirits of Dvaita belief explain the evil? According to the theory of Svarūpa-bhēda, some souls by nature are good and others wicked incapable of reaching mukti or liberation. As the actions proceed from the nature of beings, now it is clear that evil and wickedness flow from the wicked spirits. We may again pose a question here as to "are not the mukti-ayōgya jīvas (souls) too dependent on Viṣṇu eternally? And their 'satta' is dependent on Viṣṇu? So is it true that ultimately the Svarūpa of beings explain the evil in this universe?

Rarest Archiver

Madhva's basic belief is that the supreme Lord Viṣṇu is the principle agent in all beings and induced by Viṣṇu alone all the beings act. Madhva explicitly accepts that at the command of Viṣṇu, Śiva and others composed the durāgamas in order to keep the wicked jīvas (souls) in ignorance. If we accept this proposition, can we not hold that Viṣṇu himself as the cause of evil? Now it is clear that no religious man can accept such a position. Viṣṇu is impartial and goodness itself. Thus it is clear that when Madhva faces the problem of evil, he only shifts from karma to Svarūpabhēda and back to karma itself. And at the same time Madhva maintains that all things and beings are totally dependent on God, and God is the ultimate cause of the activities of finite beings. Thus it is clear that Madhva silently accepts the fact that the problem of evil cannot be satisfactorily solved at the level of human thinking.

2.29.5.CONCEPTION OF THE WORLD IN MADHVA:

The Supreme Lord according to Madhva is the eternal Lord of the eternal realities, viz., the Jīvas (souls) and Prakṛti (Primary matter). Viṣṇu is the Sarvanāmamata (Viṣṇu as the primary purport of every word). It is only relation to this world, Viṣṇu's Sarvanāmata, his attributes and his unmanifestations can be comprehended.

Starting from the foundations of Sense-perception and Sākṣyanubhava and infernce resting on them and interpreting the truths of Scripture in accordance with the authority of Sākṣi-pramāṇa and Upa-jīvya-pramāṇa, Śrī Madhva arrives at a realistic metaphysics in which God, as Svatantra, occupies the central position, with matter and souls keeping their legitimate positions under him. This reality as a whole is expressed in a system of fivefold distinction, which gives it

Rarest Archiver

its philosophical designation of "Prapanca". This valuable five fold difference is "Prapanca."

The word "Prapanca", is derived from the substantive "pancan" with the suffix "da" (a) signifying 'kind'. The prefix "pra" denotes 'excellence' or value. It is excellent in the sense that knowledge of this fivefold difference constitutes right knowledge that leads to Mokṣa."This fivefold difference is the difference that exists as between Jīvas, Jadas (material principles) and Brahman on the one hand and mutually among Jivas and Jadas themselves on the other".[45] Viṣṇu alone is the cause of production (srṣti), support (sthiti) and dissolution (saṁhāra) of the universe, for such is the teaching of the Sacred tradition(Cf. AV.I.1.90; BS. Bh.I.1, 2). According to Madhva, there are eight cosmic powers that proceed from the supreme Viṣṇu: 1.Creation (sṛṣti), 2.Sustenance (sthiti), 3.Dissolution (samhara), 4.Control (niyama), 5.Obscuration (ajñāna), 6.Enlightenment (jñāna), 7. Bondage (bandha) and 8. Liberation (mokṣa) (Cf. BS. Bh. I 1.2).

2.29.6.REFUTATION OF THE RIVAL SCHOOLS:

Through his philosophico-theologico arguments Madhva refutes the schools of thought which affirmed that Viṣṇu is not the cause of the origin of this world. He strongly affirmed that this world is an ordered and purposeful 'thing' and the producer of this such world should be endowed with knowledge and thereby he proved that Prakṛti, atoms, void, vijñāna, śiva, śakti cannot be the cause of this universe.

Viṣṇu has not created this world by self-division (dhevidhabūti) or by transformation (vikṛti) into this pluralistic world and into matter and jīves (souls). God is

---

[45]. S.S.Rāghavacār,VTV. Nos. 325, 340, B.N.K.Sharma Teachings, p.78.

Rarest Archiver

unalterable, flawless, absolutely perfect and he cannot be transformed himself into this bad world that is affected by many and varied defects. According to Madhvs's understanding, God's creative activity touches the intrinsic nature of Prakṛti and his activity lasts always. In his Brahma sūtra Bhāṣya, Madhva holds that the supreme Lord alone is the motive behind this universe; he, as the author of this world is endowed with knowledge and he is omnipotent and independent Absolute Being. The supreme God possesses the absolute power and he alone determines the affairs of this world. No finite being or souls (as they do not possess the absolute power) can be the cause of this universe.

Madhva strongly believes that as it is taught in Śruti, Viṣṇu alone is the Supreme Being; he alone is the cause of all things and Siva as an unembodied being cannot cause the world; neither he is the author of this world. The world of duality is comprehended by the supreme Lord and is protected by him and hence it is not a product of illusory imagination.[46]

"This scheme of Pancabhēda is not illusory—as it is cognized by God, maintained and controlled by Him; for there can be no illusions for God." In this passage Śrī Madhva controverts the position that the world is an illusory projection of the cosmic mind. Our sacred literature is full of references to the creation, preservation, regulation, and control of the world of matter and souls by a Supreme Being. The material world is the field or environment provided for the spiritual evolution of souls. God cannot possibly have given us an illusory environment to develop in; nor could He be mistaken in perceiving the world in which we live, move and have our being and taking the trouble to help, guide and

---

[46]. S.S.Rāghavachār,VTV. No. 328,p.71.

Rarest Archiver

control our lives therein in various ways. There is enough evidence in the Scripture that God perceives us and the world in which we live (Cf. Svet. Up. I, 3.iii, 12; v.5) as factual realities. What is thus directly perceived by a cosmic mind cannot be illusory: "A magician does not perceive his own magical creations. God perceives the Universe, always. So, it is not illusory like a magician's projections."(VTV.p.28). This passage reinforces the above argument by showing the difference between a real creation and a false appearance, such as it projected by a magician. A magician does not actually see such objects as magical elements projected by him. But God sees the world as the world and sustains it (Cf. Gītā: xv.13). If this universe is to be regarded as imagined by our delusion (as the illusory snake in the rope), it would require the acceptance of a real universe (as the prototype of the imagined one) and a real substratum (i.e., to say, two reals)". "No theory of illusions can be demonstrated without at least two reals: a substratum (ādhisthāna) of the illusion and a prototype (pradhāna) of the superimposed object (āropya).[47]

2.29.7.THE MEANING AND NATURE OF CREATION:

According to Madhva, there are two orders of causes and they are distinguished as, 1.Material Cause (Upādanakāraṇa) and 2.Efficient Cause (Nimittakāraṇa) The In material cause Prakṛti undergoes transformation and it acquires (āpti) new specifications (viśeṣas). The independent Viṣṇu alone is the active power who transforms prakṛti in its acquisition of new specifications (viśeṣas). The acquisition of specifications is dependent (parādhīna) on another that is Viṣṇu (efficient cause). Therefore it is through the material cause (prakrti)

---

47. B.N.K.Sharma, Teachings, pp.79-80.

Rarest Archiver

and efficient cause (Viṣṇu-nimitta) the origination of the world takes place in Dvaita Vedānta. Thus this material world is neither a transformation (pariṇāma) of Viṣṇu or a production out of nothing. This world (sṛṣṭi) is the result of the evolution of Prakṛti and of the union of souls with bodies. It is through the action of Brahman what is in the womb of matter and souls are actualized. Therefore, in the work of creation the existing realities acquire a new state of being only depending on the will of Brahman.

Madhva uses the term "cause" in the sense that a world of imperfect beings and of ceasless change is explicable only as they are dependent on a Supreme Being. He, Himself is unchanging and perfect in every way and his constant presence in them educes the series of forms latent in matter and brings the souls nearer to their self-development at every step; and thus brings them into full play and actual manifestations (Cf. BSB, ii.3.31).

2.29.8.'ETERNAL CREATION' THRO' PARĀDHĪNAVIŚEṢĀPTI:

According Madhva, all the other beings both eternal and non-eternals are absolutely dependent on independent Viṣṇu. Here dependency is a relation that is true of eternals and non-eternals (Cf. Sharma Philosophy, p.225).

Questions can be posed here as to how can God as creator exercise his control over the co-existent eternal entities? How is the existence of eternal and uncreated substances like space, time, souls (jīves) as well as finite realities be derived from one Supreme source of all? To this Madhva answers, the concept of being is distinguished into two kinds, 1.Production of substance or creation out of nothing (de novo): - Madhva rejects this concept of creation out of nothing. For him God cannot create the world out nothing. If this world is created out of nothing, then one should presume

Rarest Archiver

as consequence that this world would be completely annihilated at the end of the world. And again the creation in time may also mean that is open to various difficulties and inconsistencies (a question asked here, 'what makes Brahman to come out and create the universe at a particular time?). 2. Production, for its acquisition of a change or modification of state depends on the will of Viṣṇu-God (parādhīna viśeṣāpti). Madhva gives answer to the question of creation) through this theory.

2.29.9.MEANING OF THE DOCTRINE OF PARĀDHĪNA VIŚEṢĀPTI:

According to Madhva, time, space, matter, jīvas and Vēdas are eternal entities (Nityapadārthas or Anādinitya) which are conceived to be existing from eternity without beginning or end. There are also non-eternal (anitya) entities that are created at a particular time and place and they have a beginning and an end. These anitya entities come into being in their entirety, they undergo change in their nature, and they also are annihilated. So these non-eternal entities are created ones. If so, how then 'creation' is applied to the eternal entities (space, time, matter, jīves etc.?). At this juncture, Madhva introduces his new theory of 'Eternal creation' or creation of eternal entities through parādhīna viśēṣāpti.

According to Madhva, Viṣṇu is the mūla (root) of this universe only through his efficient (causative) causality and he does not undergo any type of transformation. Viṣṇu is the cause of this universe, just as the soul of a seed (bīja-jīva) is the cause of a shoot. It should be clearly borne in mind that Viṣṇu is not like the one who is the cause for the body of a son (Cf.Ch. Up. Bh. VI, 8).

2.29.10.CRITIQUE OF BRAHMA-PARIṆĀMAVĀDA AND VIVARTA-VĀDA:

Rarest Archiver

Madhva strongly holds that Viṣṇu cannot be the Supportive (material) cause of the world nor the world is a modification of the Supreme Being (Brahma-Pariṇāma). He writes: "Whatever is not in keeping with the majesty of the Lord, what is opposed to his Lordship is evidently unfit for him. All proofs and statements should be understood in consonance with his Sovereigneity (Cf. AV. I. 4, 58ff). If we accept Brahman's modifications, it is a real insult to his Lordship and it is a sort of pantheism that pulls him down and utterly negates his independence. Thus we cannot conceive any modification as regards Brahman and it is inconsistent to assume that Brahman 'as the perfect one in himself', out of his own free-will chooses to transmute himself into this universe of beings and objects which are in the state of sin, evil, misery, with many limitations, bondage and real sufferings. He is partless and indivisible and not even a part of him can be modified into the world. Thus Madhva strongly refutes and rejects the Pariṇāmavāda that holds that Brahman is himself the stuff of which this world is made. According to the scriptures and reason, there is unbridgeable gulf between spirit and matter, cit and jada (Cf. AV.I,4,11). Viṣṇu is essentially Saccidananda and so as a perfect Being of pure intelligence and bliss. Thus nothing can evolve out of him as an effect that is inert and wholly lacks in intelligence and which is the abode of much misery and subject to endless change. Thus there is the material cause of this universe else where other than Brahman. Therefore we see Madhva rejecting the Brahma-Pariṇāma-vāda under any form, aspects, modes or powers that are considered as essential organic parts of Brahman.

2.29.11.CRITIQUE OF VIVARTA-VĀDA:

Advaitins maintain that Brahman (all Absolute) is the real substratum of this world and this world is only an

Rarest Archiver

illusory appearance superimposed on the reality of Brahman (it is called Vivarta-vāda). Brahman really does not act or produce this world. His activity and the effect of this activity are illusory, though they have a real substratum, which is nothing but his own absolute reality. The sub schools of Advaita have explained in different ways the illusory appearance of the world. Brahman because of its māyā (illusory power) appears as the world or throws up an illusory world, or the jīva (souls) because of their ignorance think of the world as real. In any case the Advaitins do not accept the reality of the world. Madhva dismisses this view. First of all, for Madhva, the world is real, it has a reality of its own distinct from the reality of Brahman, though dependent on him. The real Brahman is a real cause and the real activity of Brahman produces a real effect.[48] Thus for Madhva, the clear fact that Prakṛti is a metaphysically dependent principle like space and time (though eternal) is the plurality of causes (Cf. BS. Bh, II, 1,15ff).

2.29.12.THE DVAITA THEROY OF SAD-ASAT-KĀRYA-VĀDA:

The theory of causality or creation is called Sad-Asat-Kārya-Vāda in Dvaita Vedānta. By this we understand that a product (effect) before its existence is existent with respect to its cause (or is existed as cause alone) and non-existent with respect to its state as product (effects) (before a product came into existence, there was only cause and once that product comes into existence there is effect alone and no cause exists), but on the other hand, it is existent after its existence as a product(effect), but it is non-existent as a cause. According to the *Saṁkhyas*, the effect preexists in the supportive cause *(upādanakāraṇa)*. Because of the mere presence

---

48. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free,(Madurai: Dialogue Series, No.5,1985), pp.176-177.

Rarest Archiver

of the *puruṣa (Sannidhimātra) Prakṛti* begins to evolve and to manifest effects potentially contained in it. In fact nothing really new comes into existence. The effects are already in the cause. (This type of theory of causation is known as Satkāryavāda). This extreme view is unacceptable to the Dvaitins.[49]

2.29.13.VIṢṆU AND THE INSTRUMENTS(SĀDHANAS) USED IN CREATION:

According to Śruti (sacred texts) Brahman makes use of various means like prakṛti, space, and time to produce the universe. Brahman creates man in accordance with his Karma. Does Viṣṇu make use of any independent materials or instruments in the production of this universe as it is clear from our experience that a weaver makes use of independent materials in the production of a piece of cloth? Can we hold that these instruments or sādhanas bind the freedom of Brahman? This world has proceeded to its existence from the essential power of Viṣṇu (Cf. BS. Bh.II, 1.15).

In relation to the causality of Viṣṇu we cannot speak of any independent material or instrument. Thus, though Viṣṇu makes use of some means or instruments in his work of creation, their power to be means or instruments comes from Viṣṇu alone. Even the very determination that such or such realities would be used as means of creation come from the will of Hari, the Lord. (Svecchaniyama)(Cf. AV. II, 92; BS. Bh.II, 1,15). Only the finite and dependent agents are in need of materials or instruments in order to effect something. Viṣṇu is the independent agent on whom the instrumentality (sādhanatva) of the instruments depends (BS.Bh, II, 1.15).

---

49. Ibid.,pp. 177-178.

Rarest Archiver

Further, the use of materials (sādhanas) in one's activity is no imperfection; on the contrary, it is a sign of power and Lordship provided the materials used are not independent of the agent (BS. Bh. II, 1,19). Viṣṇu makes use of various materials in the production of the world, but all these are dependent on him even from eternity since he alone is the independent cause. The freedom of Viṣṇu is such that he could have created the world with or without these auxiliary causes or instruments (Cf. AV. II, 1.15). For example, God uses "Prakṛti" as the material cause of the world just as a man, though capable of walking on foot with no aid, uses a stick to lean on out of sport (BH. Gi.Bh., IX,8) By the fact that God uses many instruments and means in his creative work, he manifests his glory and majesty.

Madhva again holds that Viṣṇu dispenses everything in accordance with the karma (adṛṣta) of each jīva and that world is so constituted as to be best-suited instrument of the jīva to enjoy or to suffer, for their karma. In Madhva's doctrine, karma does not bind the Lord nor does it limit his freedom, because the very karma of the jīva depends on the Supreme Being. "Substance, karma, time, the essential nature of beings, jīvas exist by his Viṣṇu's favor; in its absence they do not exist (Bhāg. Pur, II, 10,12; AV.I, 1,13). Since the karma being unconscious material principle, it can work or produce effects only under the sovereign will of the Lord which is the conscious principle.

2.29.14.MADVA'S THEORY OF THE EVOLUTION OF THE WORLD:

According to Madhva, the prakṛti (the primodial matter) is eternal and indestructible; the creation of the world (sṛṣti) and dissolution (pralaya) happens regularly in a recurring rotation. At the end of the world, every world-creation follows perpetually and after a long respite, a

Rarest Archiver

new world-creation follows. Therefore, for Madhva, the evolution (creation) and reabsorption (involution) of the world happens countless times eternally. Madhva bases for his theory of the constitution of matter and the evolution of the world on the 'Śaṁkhya' metaphysics of Upaniṣads, the Epics and Purāṇas.[50]

It is the iccha (will) of Viṣṇu to create this universe produces a stir in the prakṛti, it disturbs the equilibrium of its qualities and thereby sets in motion the evolution process. Later the primordial matter (prakṛti) undergoes various modifications and it develops by a process of evolution and involution of effects. In this process of evolution the unmanifest becomes manifest and this manifest evolves into many forms taking on new qualities (viśeṣas).

2.29.15.THE PROCESS OF EVOLUTION AND INVOLUTION:

Prakṛti, both directly and indirectly is the material cause of the world. It is the direct material cause of time and the three qualities of sattva, rajas and tamas and only indirectly of Mahat, Ahaṁkara, etc. It is both eternal and pervasive; but not unlimited. The three guṇas are supposed to be differentiated at the beginning of creation, in the ratio of 4:2:1(BT, iii.11.14). The evolution of other forms of matter takes place on account of the disturbance in their equipoise which gives rise to the twenty-four principles commonly recognized, viz. mahat, Ahaṁkara, Buddhi, Manas, ten sensory organs, five-sense-objects and the five great elements. Mahat is the first and finest evolute of matter and energy. Ahaṁkara is the principle of individuation, Buddhi that of discrimination, and manas of thought. The principle of Ahaṁkara is divided into three classes of Vaikārika, Taijasa

---

[50]. Ibid., p.186.

Rarest Archiver

and Tāmasa. From Taijasa the ten sense organs are produced, and the five sense objects (viṣayas) and the elements are the products of Tamasa-Ahaṁkara. The tanmatras stand for qualitatively distinct and irreducible sense-qualities with a definite leaning towards their appropriate objects. These twenty-four evolutes of Prakṛti are the constituents of the microcosm and the macrocosm of the entire Brahmaṇḍa. Madhva gives a proper reorientation to this theory of material evolution by linking it up with a systematic hierarchy of presiding deities from top to bottom. It is under the constant supervision and guidance of these Abhimāni-dēvatas(or Tattvagbhimānins) that all material transformations and psychophysical functions are carried on. The Supreme Brahman itself is ultimately behind all these activities and of each and every one of them (BSB,ii.3.11).

The three forms of matter, viz., Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, are specially controlled by the three aspects of Cētana-prakṛti, viz., Śrī, Bhu and Durga (Cf. BT,x.94.15). The period of creation is said to be one-eighth of the period of involution (BT,p.71b). Involution takes place by the merger of the effects in their causes in the reverse order of evolution.[51]

2.29.16.THE REALITY OF THE WORLD:

According to Madhva, the world is as real as Viṣṇu himself and are intimately related. The creation originates out of the material causality called prakṛti which is subserveient to the will of Brahaman. The Śaṅkara Vedanta and Mādyamik Buddhism schools taught from the transcendental stand point (pāramarthika Dṛṣṭi) that this world is not real. For them, from the absolute stand point of view, Brahman or sūnya

---

[51]. B.K.N.Sharma, Philosophy,pp.235-236.

Rarest Archiver

is the only reality and this world-order is a false appearance caused by avidya or māyā. Through this māyāvāda theory, the Advaitins discredited the reality of creation. They had classified the reality into: Pāramarthika Vyavahārika and Pratibhāsika but Madhva rejected these threefold classifications and affirmed that the realities of the world and of the reality of creation are metaphysical facts.

Madhva bases his realistic metaphysics on sound epistemological propositions (premises). The reality of the world-experience comes as a consequence of Sākṣyānubhāva. Pratyakṣa gives validity or conclusion to the reality of the world-experience (The self validity of knowledge has meaning through the validity of pratyakṣa). In matters concerning to sensuous perception, pratyakṣa has to be cited with authority. We perceive the world as real so our perceptual knowledge must be held true. Thus it is on the firm foundation of Saksi Pratyakṣa, Madhva built his edifice of realistic metaphysics.

Madvha strongly holds that the sacred texts testify to the reality of the world. The Upaniṣad especially mention that Brahman is the creator, preserver, regulator and controller of this real world creation, world of matter and souls. The Upaniṣads uphold "a real world, real souls and real God". He writes " Therefore, nowhere in the Sacred texts the unreality of the world is proclaimed.[52]

And again, the sacred texts mention that Brahman produced real beings that are uncountable. For Madhva, the scheme of Pancabhēda is not illusory". "The world of duality is comprehended by the Supreme Lord and is protected by him and hence it is not a product of illusory imagination". Surely the Lord cannot be liable to illusions'. "The supreme Self is

---

[52]. Rāghavachār VTV.No.257,. P.55.

Rarest Archiver

real. The individual self is real. Difference is real, difference is real, and difference is real".[53]

Madhva strongly maintains that Viṣṇu provides this material world as a field for the Spiritual evolution or in other words liberation of souls. Thus this world is not an illusory environment for liberation. Viṣṇu perceives human beings and this world as factual reality. Therefore 'what Viṣṇu perceives cannot be illusory'." It further says: 'the magician does not see the magic. But the Lord always sees the universe. Therefore it is to be resolved that it is not a magically produced illusion.[54]

2.29.17.VIṢṆU AND SUSTENANCE(STHITI), RULING(NIYATI) AND DISSOLUTION(PRALAYA) OF THE WORLD:

Though Viṣṇu is independent from the world yet he has strong connection with the world. This universe and all other beings are totally dependent on Viṣṇu(Cf. BS.Bh. II.2.5). The Vaiṣṇāva catechetical formula which Madhva always makes use in his writings that Viṣṇu alone is the source of origin, support, government, destruction (of the world) and of ignorance, bondage and liberation (Mukti) of jīves (souls). Therefore the relationship of Viṣṇu is Nitya (eternal) and avinābhava (inseparable). Madhva comments on the Brahma-Sūtras and writes that Viṣṇu is the Sthiti (supporting cause), niyati (ruler) and lastly Pralaya (destroyer) of this world. As Madhva himself says: "If it is said that both the production and the destruction (of the world) depend on Viṣṇu, but its continuation in existence (sthiti) depends on its own proper nature, without any reference to him (Viṣṇu) that is not correct, for the very nature of all(beings) depend on him(Cf. BS. Bh, I, 1,2; AV. I,1,90) alone.

---

53. Ibid.,VTV. Nos, 328,329, 273,p.71.
54. Ibid.,VTV,No.370,p.78.

Rarest Archiver

The word 'sthiti' derived from the root stha 'to stand' may be translated as 'permanence in being.' 'That which has received its origin from Viṣṇu is also sustained by him' can be the correct meaning of 'sthiti'. The causality of origination etc., specially rests with Viṣṇu. He alone is the support of the primary matter, souls and time; he supports the earth, heaven and all the worlds. Also, he is the ruler of everything (Tat.Pr. on BSBh. I.1.2). In his commentary on the 2nd part of the VTV, Jayatīrtha makes certain precisions. "Concerning the souls, origination signifies the production of the body, 'sthiti' remains the permanence of the soul in the bodily state, 'niyati' stands for the binding of the soul by means of injunctions and prohibitions. As regards the immortal gods, their birth consists in their 'appearance', their 'sthiti' in the absence of death, their 'niyati' in their subordination to the commands of Viṣṇu. Viṣṇu grants to the different beings their activities too (VTV,Ti.pp.342-343). From these functions have their origin in Viṣṇu. From these remarks of Jayatīrtha, it appears that for Madhva the 'sthiti' of the world signifies the permanence of the world in its manifest state, owing to the supporting causality of Viṣṇu(dhārakatvam).

Viṣṇu is imperishable Lord, he supports all beings by being present in them all through many ways. "The world is called 'antra', because it is pervaded by Viṣṇu, who is the activating force. He is the mūladhāraka(primary or root supporter) of this world. By him is the world made real(satya) and its nature is maintained by him. Therefore, it is described as 'asatya'. The all pervading Lord is the reality of realities. He is to the world what the sun is to the rainbow. The Upanisad passage concerning him is, "He is the

Rarest Archiver

Real of reals; life-principles are real and of them he is Real.[55]

As Viṣṇu is the supporting cause of the universe, so is he the cause of the activity of the beings by 'effective presence' in the various potencies of these beings. Viṣṇu is present in the heart and at the root of the hearing faculty; he is present in the eyes and in all the senses. Those persons possessing salvific knowledge (jñānins) know that all the activities are from Viṣṇu, indwelling in them.[56] According to Madhva, the deities too are instruments in the hand of Viṣṇu for the support and government of this universe. For Madhva, Viṣṇu is "the over Lord of all(Sarvādhipati), the protector of all(sarvapāla) and Lord of all(Sarveśa). Just as the cause of the origination of the world, and its supporting cause and ruler, so is he the cause of its dissolution. What is meant by the last part of this formula is that beings which have origination from, and are supported by Viṣṇu, do not disappear by themselves; the cause of their disappearance or reabsorption is Viṣṇu. As in the origination, support and ruling of the world, so in its dissolution too, Viṣṇu's causality (Kartrvam) is at work, "He who was at the beginning of the world (of the manifest world) and from whom the world originated and who protects the world, from him is the dissolution of the world(Cf. Tat.Dī.p.88).

As regards ordinary souls, (souls in body) dissolution (pralaya) stands for death(VTV.Ṭī.p.343). For all beings, however, dissolution means the reabsorption into the unmanifest state. It is to be noted here that Madhva, like other Vedāntins, admits a partial and a total dissolution. The

---

55. Ibid.,VTV. No.263,p.57.
56. Mund. Up. Bh. III,. 1. 4; BSBh. II.2.3; Puthiadam, Op.Cit., p.212.

Rarest Archiver

partial dissolution or reabsorption affects only the three worlds, viz., the Bhu, Bhuvar and Svarga lokas, although the gods dwelling in these worlds are not touched by it. But the total dissolution affects the whole universe. The process of dissolution is exactly the opposite of the process of origination; the inferior beings are absorbed into the superior and finally the whole is covered over by Viṣṇu. According to the Br. A. Up. L. 2.1., 'Laksmi, the souls, prime-matter in the perfect harmony of its three qualities(sattva, rajas and tamas), actions and the residue of actions, life breath, the five sense (the internal senses), the Vēdas and time remain in an inactive and unmanifest manner all through the long night of dissolution(Cf. Br.A. Up. Bh. I.2.1). The dissolution of the world, even its total dissolution does not mean annihilation.[57]

2.30.THE ANTHROPOLOGY OR THE CONCEPTION OF MAN:

In the understanding of Madhva, God conditions 'Man' and man is dependent of Him. Man is a composite, finite, spiritual substance and matter and he exists here and now in a body; his body is an evolute of matter. As he exists in a milieu, other human beings surround him and he finds his existence in a world that is in space and time. Thus man is called as member of a society. He is agent and enjoyer as well as subject to birth and death. The life of man is complicated and complex because he lives in the midst of inequalities and the evil filled world.

2.30.1.THE NATURE OF THE SOUL(JĪVA-SVARŪPA):

According to Madhva, the 'Self' is to be established by Sākṣyānubhava. His definition of the self is " He who is only

---

Puthiadam, Op.Cit.,pp.214-215.

Rarest Archiver

cognizable as "I" is called the jīva. It is he that suffers and enjoys. It is he that is bound and that gets liberated.[58]

"He who enjoys the happiness and suffers the ills of life, who is eligible for bondage and release, is the Jīva. He is indeed in a position to know himself, in all his states, as "I am". This implies that the Jīva is a permanent entity that endures in and through its changing states of consciousness and experiences, which constitute the sum total of its life here and in the hereafter. The pragmatic necessity of assuming a permanent self can well be understood in the light of the primary instinct to be and to survive. That is why our Upaniṣads emphasize the indestructibility of the self and its attributes as well (Brh. Up). These attributes of the self are the potential powers of conscious life here and in the 'beyond'. Without such a continuity and survival of individual consciousness, the goal of Mukti would be void of meaning and purpose (Sharma, Teachings, pp. 87-88). According to Jayatīrtha, the Jīva is that which is endowed with the powers of agency and enjoyership, which possesses a 'form' but is different from the physical body; and which reveals as the 'I' (of subject of knowledge) by the witnessing consciousness.

2.30.2.SOUL IS DIFFERENT FROM GOD AND MATTER:

Madhva in his Tattvasaṁkhyāna says, that the soul is a dependent, positive, eternal and conscious substance. According to the Saṁkhya system the soul is 'Puruṣa', which is inactive. Saṅkara would understand that there is only One conscious being who is Brahman; and Brahman is the Absolute, the only reality in this world and He is identical with the true self of man. Madhva maintains that the numberless finite spiritual beings or souls are dependent on one infinite,

---

58. S.S.Rāghavachār VTV. No. 290,p.64.

Rarest Archiver

conscious being that is Visnu. As regards the Rāmānuja understanding, the souls form the body of Viṣṇu. Thus Rāmānuja system expresses the God-Soul relationship in the terminology of soul-body relationship. But Madhva rejects all these above views and holds that both God and soul are completely distinct from each other.

2.30.3.THE SOUL'S RELATION TO VIṢṆU:

Madhva expresses the nature of soul through a metaphor namely, 'Reflection'. For him soul is reflection of Viṣṇu. Thus the relation between Viṣṇu and soul is 'The reflected object to its reflection' bimbapratibimbhāva. The soul is the reflection of God himself and not of a material thing. God is omnipresent and his contact with the medium of reflection cannot be destroyed. Viṣṇu reflects himself on the soul as its medium and because soul is essentially spiritual. In the words of Jayatīrtha, 'How can something be at once the medium and the reflection? Because such a thing does not fall within the sphere of experience. The answer would be that in the spiritual beings this (that they are both medium and reflection), is possible because precisely they are 'conscious' (cidrūpa) and because they are eternal(Cf. Pr.Dī. on Bh. Gī. Bh.II.18).

The existence, consciousness and bliss of the soul have their counterpart in Viṣṇu. While the existence, consciousness and bliss of Viṣṇu are infinite, the existence, consciousness and bliss of the soul are finite. The Existence, consciousness and bliss are the essential attributes of soul and therefore they are inseparable from its nature. The soul is eternal like Viṣṇu; it is uncreated and is not subject to any destruction. It exists forever and it has strong desire for its own release. Though Viṣṇu has the permanent pervasion, the soul has the temporal one. The existence of the soul is limited in

Rarest Archiver

space for it has a form (Ākāra). The soul has a form that consists of bliss and consciousness just as a lamp flame has a form. Because the soul endows with this form, it occupies the subtle and gross bodies, which are products of matter or prakrti. The size of a soul is atomic (aṇu-parimāṇa) that makes the soul possible of its transmigration.

The knowledge that the soul possesses has its own limits. When the soul is in the state of bondage, ignorance covers the soul's knowledge. Although bliss is intrinsic to the soul, it is in right proportion (commensurate) with its limited consciousness. The natural bliss of the soul in its state of bondage is mixed up with lot of pain.[59]

2.30.4.THE COMPLETE DISTINCTION BETWEEN VIṢṆU AND THE SOULS.

In Madhva's understanding, whenever we have realities with opposing attributes, they, must be really distinct. Now Brahman and the soul have opposing attributes. Therefore, they are really distinct. The major needs no explanation. The minor however, needs to be explained. Madhva clearly assigns opposing attributes to Brahman and the soul. Brahman (Viṣṇu) is the Omniscient (Sarvajña), the Omnipotent (Sarvaśakta). He is the indwelling principle (Antaryāmin) and He is the one with ever realized, fully realized (Satyakāma; Āpatkāma). Whereas the soul (Jīva) has little knowledge (alpajñāna). It has only very littly power (alpasakta). It is also non-independent (asvātantra) but Viṣṇu dwells in it. It is one whose desires are not fully realized. The Jiva enjoys only what is pleasant; experiences pleasure and pain.[60] There is no need to expose futhrer the differences between Viṣṇu and jīva.

---

59. T.P. Ramachandran, Op.Cit.,p.83.
60. kata. Up. Bh. Pp.14,,15. 17; AV.I.1.96,100, 101. BSBH.I.2.8, 11 etc.S.S.Rāghavacār, VTV.No.275.

Rarest Archiver

From what has already been said it is quite clear that Viṣṇu and the soul cannot possibly be identical. The sacred texts too, Madhva thinks, proclaim with one voice the difference between Viṣṇu and the souls. The so called identity texts such as 'aham Brahmāsmi, or 'tat tvam asi' do not teach monism. Let us take for example the text 'tat tvam asi' which is repeated nine times in the 6th chapter of Cha. Up. Madhva asks his opponent to read the text and interpret it according to the rules of interpretation. If he were to do so he would realize that it means not 'tat tvam asi' but ' atat tvam asi' (thou art not that). In fact, the father of Svetakētu is teliing his son that the individual is not identical with Brahman. The Advaitin is misreading the text when he reads it as 'tat tvam asi'. All the examples given by the father teach in fact the reality of this distinction (VTV. No.224). (Just as the bird and the rope are different, the juices of the many trees are different, the rivers and the sea are different, the thief and the property stolen are different, the man and the Gāndhara country are different, so the soul and God are different). Such texts as 'I am Brahman' must be interpreted in relation to the inner ruler: the inner ruler of the soul is Brahman (VTV. No.266).

Madhva rejects too the so-called 'ēkajīvavāda' of the Advaitins, which states that there is only one soul in the world. All the other souls are considered to be the imaginary or dream products of this one jīva (VTV.no. 309ff). At the end of this section, we may describe the jiva following the account of Jayatīrtha thus: The soul is of the nature of "I" and is cognized by the internal witness. It is different from the body etc; it is endowed with a form, and the power of

Rarest Archiver

activity and enjoyment.[61] The soul is 'svaprakāśa' (self-luminous). The 'self-luminosity of the soul has a 'content', viz. "I" (aham). The nature of the soul is strength, bliss splendor and pure knowledge(BSBH.II.31).

2.30.5.THE SELF AS THE KNOWER, DOER AND ENJOYER:

Dvaita Vedānta understands that the soul (jīva) is subject of knowledge(jñāta), agent of action(karta) and the enjoyer of the fruit of action(Bhokta). When the soul is in the state of release, these above characteristics that are real are also present. The soul (self) is a knower and this is indicated by the expression "I"(aham) in any type of statement as "I know this" etc. Therefore the soul (self) knows objects other than itself also.

The Dvaita system further holds that the Soul(self) knows 'itself'. "I know myself" is a common expression which is a sufficient evidence to signify that the self(soul) knows itself. The statement 'I know myself' does not refer at all to the body but only refers to the self(soul). Thus it is possible for the same self(soul) to the both subject and object of knowledge. It is only because of the presence of Viśeṣas, the self(soul) makes a distinction between itself as the subject and itself as the object. Therefore self-knowledge is possible and it is self-luminosity (sva-prakāśatva) for Madhva(Cf. G.T. XIII, 13).

2.30.6.THE SOUL (JĪVĀTMAN) AND BODY:

Madhva Dvaita maintains, that there are Gross body (Sthūla-Śarīra) and a Subtle body (Sūkṣma or linga śarīra) and every soul that is caught up in the human situation(Samsāra) has these two types of bodies. The gross body is the external or sensible body; this body is born, it grows and dies. It is

---

61. B.N.K. Sharma, Philosophy,p.177.

Rarest Archiver

composed principally of earth; and other products of matter too are found in it. This body consists the external sense organs and the faculties of action. The soul at its each birth possesses a new gross body perfectly in accordance with the state of its past karma and it is not united with the soul from eternity (Cf. BS. Bh.II. 4.22,23)

The Subtle body (Sūkṣma or linga śarīra) is the product of subtle matter. This subtle body has inner subtle faculties of knowledge and action. The five life breaths, mind (manas) that give unity to all human actions, form part of this subtle body. This subtle body is united to the soul from eternity and will remain united to the soul till its liberation is attained; and this subtle body wanders with the soul in the course of its trasmigratory existence (Cf. kath.Up. Bh. P.12).

Both the gross and subtle bodies are evolutes from matter and in themselves are non-conscious, non-knowing substances. Matter is subordinate to the spirit, so also both gross and subtle bodies are sub-ordinate to the soul. The soul and matter are connected from the beginning (Cf. BS. Bh. II. 4.,22,23).

The positive ignorance (Karaṇa-śarīra or Avidya) is the third entity which is connected with the soul from beginningless time till the time of release. This third entity is said to be a part of the 'tamōguṇa' of matter, and it enchains the soul to the state of bondage (Positive ignorance (avidya) here is both real and destructible. It is not simply a negative element. It must be recognized as a positive force in view of its being a product of tamoguna encircling the soul and getting destroyed by aparōkṣajñāna.[62] Viṣṇu causes this third entity to arise and to enchain the soul to the bodies.

Dominic, Op.Cit.,p.298.

Rarest Archiver

Thus the situation of man as man arises when a finite spiritual soul, gross body and fine body (subtle) join together to form a single unit and when this whole composite is "covered over" by ignorance.[63]

2.30.7.THE REASON FOR THE UNION OF SOUL AND MATTER:

The soul which is in itself knowledge, being and bliss gets itself united to matter because of its past karma. But this is only an immediate explanation. In order to avoid further difficulties, Madhva, like the other Indian thinkers, says that this union is beginningless. According to Madhva, all souls (except Laksmi) are in beginningless possession of karmic bodies.[64]

The souls are reflection of Viṣṇu and by divine necessity find in themselves the fullness of their nature under the guidance of Viṣṇu's favor by becoming united with the matter. Therefore karma and the soul's nature are only the 'secondary causes whereas the primary cause of our human situation (soul-matter union) is Viṣṇu.

As it is already stated above the soul is atomic in size and it dwells in the heart. Just as sandal paste spread over one part of the body extends its refreshing fragrance all over like wise the soul pervades the whole body from the heart (Cf. BS. Bh. II,3,24).

2.30.8.MAN'S BIRTH AND DEATH:

Let us analyze under this section what exactly Madhva understands by 'birth' and 'death' of man. Generally in one sense one cannot speak of the birth of man because both soul (Jīva) and the original stuff that is matter (body) are eternal. Both soul and matter do not have death. Thus we cannot simply hold that neither the soul nor the body is born.

Puthiadam, Op.Cit.,p.237-238.
BS.Bh.II. 3.29, Puthiadam, p.238-239.

Rarest Archiver

According to Dvaita system, the union of soul with the subtle body and gross body is beginningless. So 'when is the first union of soul with the first gross body? is a question. Our study is to be about the perceptible birth or in other words the union of soul and body that takes place at a particular time of existence. In the ordinary language this type of union of soul with a particular gross body (matter) is called 'birth'. In his Bhagavatgīta Bhāṣya and Kaṭha Upaniṣad Bhāṣya, Madhva says that the birth of a soul is in other words, 'dēhasaṁbandha' or 'dēhasamyōga' which means 'the relation or union of soul with the body' (Bh.Gī.Bh.II.26; II.29; Kath.Up.Bh.p.14- Birth is the coming into being of a body. Birth is the entering of a soul into a maternal womb.[65]

The term 'dēha' here stands for a gross body in Madhva. In his VTV, he speaks about the birth of the soul that should be understood as its embodied state and of the origination of Vāsudēva (Viṣṇu) and others. The Parama-śruti says: 'In the case of Vāsudēva origination means just manifestation and nothing else. All others like Brhama have bodies that come into being through his actuating force. The body of Hari is unoriginated and eternal. The bodies of beings like Brahma are not eternal. The other beings have birth in a primary sense. But the birth of Hari is just his manifestation.[66]

According to Madhva, Viṣṇu who is seated in the soul directs the birth of the soul and with Viṣṇu it enters into the womb and takes birth with Him alone. The nature and condition of the body into which the soul enters depends on the state of its past karma. The soul is thought to enter into food, and through food it enters into the body of the father and from the father into the mother, and in the mother's womb

---

65. Puthiadam,Op.Cit.,p.240.
66. S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV. No.453, p.94.

Rarest Archiver

it enters into a new body. This is the normal birth of a soul (The whole process of the soul's wandering down from 'svarga' etc. is described in BSBh.III. 1.25-29.

Madhva distinguishes between two types of deaths: the empirical, common death, which is the separation of the soul-subtle body composite from the gross body; and the second death, which is the separation of the soul from the subtle body and which takes place at liberation (BSBh.IV.2.17; Kath.Up. Bh.p.14). Death is the decaying of the body (ibid.p.13). 'Sthūladēhaparityāga' is said to be death. In the same text Madhva clearly distinguishes between the soul's separation from the gross body and from the subtle-body. The first death is compared to the putting away of one's old clothes. As birth is an entrance into a gross body, so death is departure from the body. The soul is said to depart from the body through the heart or through the arteries of the head (BSBh.IV.2.17). Commenting on B.S. 1.3.9, Madhva says that death follows upon the departure of Viṣṇu from the body. The first death is always followed by birth. The second death, which is not followed by birth, is the final and definitive separation of the soul from matter and bondage in general.[66]

2.30.9.PLURALITY OF SOULS(SELVES) IS INTRINSIC: -

The next important question about the self is its plurality: Is there but one soul in the world or are there many of them? The Advaita philosophy of Sankara unhesitatingly rejects the doctrine of plurality of selves. But almost all other system of Indian philosophy such as Jainism, Pūrva-Mimāmsa, NyāyaVaiśēṣika, Sāṁkhya-Yōga and the theistic schools of Vedānta of Rāmānuja, Madhva, Nimbārka, Vallabha and Caitanya hold that plurality of selves is not merely an

---

[66]. Kath.Up. Bh. P.13; Puthiadam, Op.Cit., PP. 240-241.

Rarest Archiver

empirical fact. The theistic faiths of Christianity and Islam, also, accept this position.[67]

The souls are countless. Each soul is different in its individuality and character. In its bondage and liberation each soul keeps up its difference from other souls. Though Rāmānuja admits plurality of souls in both bondage and liberation, he denies qualitative difference in the souls' release state. In the understanding of Advaita, the soulhood altogether disappears in its release when the soul realizes its identity with Viṣṇu. The difference in the number and characters of the souls is the ultimate concept in the rigorously realistic and pluralistic philosophy of Madhva Vedānta. According to Dvaita understanding, our earthly life presents to us that every person is unique, though every one is similar to others. Each conscious entity is shaped into what they are by their own actions (Karmas). This rigorous logical system of Madhva would maintain that there is the intrinsic difference in the spiritual essence itself of all souls; and these intrinsic difference alone accounts for the performance of actions, accumulations of enjoyments and character traits in the soul's life of saṁsāra. And again such basic or innate 'nature' of the soul will persist in the state of its liberation also. Madhva calls this type of 'difference of a basic nature' of soul as 'Svarūpa-Bhēda'; and according to him this Svarūpa-Bhēda alone can accommodate the soul's numerical plurality with its 'freedom of will' and 'qualitative diversity.'

Every soul is a reflection (Pratibimbha) of Viṣṇu and it has in it a modicum (small or moderate amount) of Viṣṇu's essential features, such as Truth(satyam),

---

[67]. B.N.K.Sharma, Teachings, p.88.

Rarest Archiver

Consciousness(Jñānam) and Bliss(Ānanda). Each soul has its own intrinsic capacities; therefore each soul shares these characteristics in varying degrees in bondage as well as liberation (mukti). For Madhva, the uniqueness of each soul (jīva) that is obvious in bondage, persists in its liberated state too. Thus in bondage as well as in the state of liberation there are various gradations in respect of knowledge and joy of each soul. So this type of doctrine of variation in the very nature of souls is called 'Svarūpa-Tāratamya'.

2.30.10.SVARŪPA-TRAIVIDHYAM (THE THREEFOLD HIERARCHY OF SOULS):

According to each soul's intrinsic nature (svarūpa), souls are classified into three broad sections; and this classification is called, 'Svarūpabhēdavāda'. The tri-partite souls:-

1.Muktiyōgya(Salvable)

2.Nitya-Saṁsārin(Ever migrating)

3.Tamōyōgya(Damnable).

The muktiyōgya or salvable type of souls are fit for release because their character is good and they are dominated by Sattva. These souls come under the five ordered categories:-1.gods (Dēvas), 2.Sages(Ṛsi), 3.Fathers(Pitr), 4.Kings(Pā) and 5.Men(Nara). In his Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya Madhva says that the gods occupy the highest place in the hierarchy of souls and men from the lowest class of souls. Laksmi is the spouse and extremely beloved (atīpriya) of Viṣṇu and only she is eternally liberated (Nitya-mukta). She is designated as Sama-na because she is free from all imperfections. Laksmi has the cosmic sway over the destinations of souls and the modifications of matter. Though she is eternal, free from

Rarest Archiver

suffering and pain yet she is dependent of Viṣṇu. She is superior to other divine beings by being inferior to Viṣṇu. Both Viṣṇu and Laksmi co-exist, they are eternally blessed and are perfect beings. The supreme Viṣṇu rejoices in Laksmi and she has slavific and cosmic functions in the universe.

Others souls (Cētana-Varga) among the mukti-yōgyas are subject to bondage of prakṛti and they are further divided into: 1.Released souls and 2. Unreleased souls. Among these type of souls there is intrinsic gradation. According to Madhva, among the released souls there is an innate distinction and they are: - 1. Dēvas. They are 'Sarva-Prakāśá' meaning they are fit to realize God as Pervasive one. 2. Sages. They are Antaḥprakāśá and the other souls are Bahiprakāśa.

The non-released souls are salvable (mukti-yōgyas) that means they are fit to attain liberation.[68] As regards gods(dēvas), they are finite spiritual beings. They have become gods immediately because of their 'karma' and mediately because of their nature. There are different grades of gods such as: - Brahma, Sēsa, Vāyu, Gāndharva etc. They are bound to perform certain duties and they have subordinate part to play in the work of creation. Though they have few extra-ordinary powers and faculties, they are completely dependent on Viṣṇu; and Viṣṇu is the inner controller of all these gods.

According to Madhva, one can contemplate Viṣṇu in these gods in a special way because it is he who dwells in them and gives them strength and activity. But worship must belong to Viṣṇu alone. There is hierarchical order among gods; and different types of gods live in different worlds. Among the gods 'Vāyu' who is the cosmic power has a Superior place. He

---

68. B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy, p.70.

Rarest Archiver

is the breath or wind that penetrates all the elements of the world. As the supporter of all beings he conducts all beings to Viṣṇu alone. There are rajas souls who are of mixed nature. They are neither wholly good nor entirely bad. They are neither fit for release nor they are condemned to perennial bondage and these are called the Nitya-Samsārin (Ever transmigrating); these souls are ever within the cycle of birth and death and they experience pleasure and pain also.

For Madhva, the third type of souls is demons in whom tamas predominates and they are called Tamoyōgya (the damnable). Evil is their law of life and on account of this they are condemned to suffer in hell. The demons possess the extraordinary powers and they can influence humanbeings through possessing them. Though the bodies of demons are invisible at times they take human forms. The classification of souls into Traividya is a unique concept in the theology of Madhva. But in Dvaita system the last two classes of Traividya classification of souls have no hope of redemption. So it is clear that Madhva does not subscribe to the ideal of the salvation of all souls (sarva-mukti) unlike the other Indian schools of thought who accept it. Dvaita Vedānta also accepts the permanent feature of the evil present in this world. The diverse philosophical schools of thought raise the question against the Dvaita concept of damned souls and their salvation as to 'How are these damned souls be saved, and what about the grace (prasāda) of Viṣṇu in respect of them?. The Traividya classification of Madhva is severely criticized by many schools of thought. But the Dvaitins justify to these objections on the basis of factual experience as well as on the evidence of the scriptures.

2.30.11.THE PROBLEM OF EVIL:

Rarest Archiver

From the doctrine of Svarūpa-Tāratamya and Traividhyam of Madhva it is clear that the characteristic marks of this world are the inequality and evil. By their very nature (svarūpa) souls are not merely different but some of them are evil. This is the only last solution to the problem of evil in Dvaita Vedānta.

Evil cannot be attributed to God because he is all pure, Holy and full of grace. Thus the evil has to be attributed to soul alone. If we attribute evil to God, then we undermine the theism. Therefore the 'past karma' can be the correct explanation to the problem of evil. For Madhva, the chain of past karmas is beginningless and if Viṣṇu produces all things and dispenses the fruit of each being according to its past merit, it does not mean that he is dependent of 'karma'. Viṣṇu merely dispenses the fruits to each soul according to its karma of the past. Now is karma is accepted as beginningless in the problem of evil, it is also reasonable here to seek a root cause for the variation of karma in quality in each soul (jīva). For the morality, the freedom of the will is Sine qua non(essential condition). God does not interfere in the soul's freedom of the will (though he is omnipotent God theoretically). God gives each soul freedom to follow its own nature. Thus God limits his self-limitation of Omnipotence and functions as Anumānta (Sanctioner); and the souls are free to work according to their inner nature and their accumulated good or bad karmas of the past. Here, God as the sanctioner is to be understood through whom the ultimate power for everything comes and souls utilize this power according to their karmas generated by their innate nature (svarūpa). This concept can be illustrated by an analogy of a huge factory in which though the power (Electricity) flow from the same main source, the different types of machines within the factory

Rarest Archiver

work according to their capacity and nature. Thus no charge or criticism can be brought against God here. Thus the soul itself is an actor (kartṛta) and enjoyer (bhokta) of the fruits of its past good or bad actions. Hence, the presence of good and evil is to be entirely traceable to the soul itself in accordance to Svarūpa-Tāratamya and Traividhyam doctrine of Madhva.[69]

2.30.12.SIN (PĀPA),EVIL CONDUCT (ADHARMA) AND EVIL(DOṢA):

According to Madhva, a sinner is he who is ignorant of Viṣṇu and does not know him and fails in offering prescribed sacrifices to him. In his Bhagavat Gīta Bhāṣya, Madhva says, 'desire (kāma) is the root of all evil, because it is the great inducer (prēraka) to evils; and it is the cause of many sins and great enemy in the final liberation (mukti) of man.' (Cf. Bh. Gī. Bh. 3,37).

For Madhva, the good conduct (dharma) and bad conduct (adhrama) is meant Varnaśrama dharma. By 'dharma' he would mean, 'the caste duties and the duties of one's state of life done in non-attachment (Niṣkāma) manner in accordance to the prescription of the sacred texts. The 'adharma' is opposite of 'dharma'. It is from the knowledge of truth, the right conduct arises and that leads the soul to Mukti (liberation).

The wicked souls originate evil (doṣa) because they consider themselves as independent from Viṣṇu and they dare to steal the divinity of Viṣṇu. Therefore 'sin' meant here is 'the self-idolatry' and by 'evil' it is meant, an attitude and action contrary to Viṣṇu's majesty. Therefore in Madhva's understanding, the ignorance of Viṣṇu is the root of evil and

---

[69]. Tapasyānanda, Bhakti schools of Vedānta: Śrī Madhvācārya, (Madras: Śrī Ramasrishna Math,1990),p.179.

Rarest Archiver

this evil arises from the very basic nature of souls (jīva-svarūpa).[70]

2.31.VIṢṆU AND THE LAST DESTINY OF MAN:

Madhva Vedānta teaches that the ultimate end of human life is God. Through his good or bad acts, man turns toward or devitate from God who is his ultimate end. God alone can bestow the perfect happiness (ānanda-supernatural vision) on man through his grace (Prasāda) and not the creatures. All finite spiritual beings exept Laksmi are in bondage to whichever class they may belong, and they have experienced or are experiencing sufferings. The gods, Yōgins and Fathers (Pitṛ) are under the bondage and the desire (kāma), anger (krōdha) all these influence them. All these spiritual beings too have to work for their own liberation (mukti) and obtain the same through the grace of Viṣṇu.

2.31.1.THE SOURCE AND NATURE OF BONDAGE(BANDHA):

According to Jayatīrtha, the word bondage (bandha) means 'the uniting or binding of a soul to a subtle body (Cf. VTV. Ti. P.343). Thus, as regards man, the state of bondage may mean the very human situation itself. And again 'bandha' also means the union of soul with the subtle and gross bodies and all the consequences that flow from this union. So we can say that 'bondage' is beginningless.

The ignorance (avidya or ajñāna) is the cause of soul's bondage and Viṣṇu is the one who covers the soul with ignorance. The ignorance is also beginningless. When the soul is ignorant of its relationship to independent Viṣṇu, its dependency on Viṣṇu for its, existence, knowledge and activity, then this ignorance leads it to be in bondage. This is called Svabhāva-ajñāna-vāda in Dvaita Vedānta. Bondage is

---

[70]. Puthiadam, Op.Cit.,pp.336-337.

Rarest Archiver

as real as the cosmos itself and it is a part of the cosmic activity of Viṣṇu. According to Madhva, the sacred texts and the infallible testimony of the 'witnessing self (sākṣin) which immediately experiences pain and sorrow etc, testify to the reality of man's bondage. If bondage is considered to be unreal then liberation and sacred texts' teachings are also unreal. The consequence of the soul in bondage is that it is in the transmigratory state; and it is subject to birth, death, and rebirth. In the Viṣṇu Tattva Vinirṇaya, Madhva says, "Viṣṇu alone binds through the fetters of transmigration and he alone is the liberator. He alone is the giver of freedom. Viṣṇu alone is the supreme Brahman. There is no doubt about that".[71]

The soul in bondage is also subject to suffering. There are three fold pains or sufferings. 1.the bodily and psychological, 2.the suffering caused by other earthly beings, 3.the sufferings caused by non-earthly beings. When the soul forgets its real nature and identifies itself with its 'ego' (which is a psychosomatic complex), this false identification brings forth evils like 'desire', anger, attachment (sensible objects (kāma, krodha, rāga etc). These evils form the driving force of our human activities (Bh. Gī. Bh. III, 37).

The second consequence of a soul in bondage is that though a soul is completely dependent on Viṣṇu, it identifies itself with its 'ego', imagines itself to be an independent being from Viṣṇu. The soul here falsely appropriates itself to all its actions performed. Madhva says, "Those dull persons who propound this unity of atman do so because they do not comprehend the truth of the sastras and are fooled by skill in argumentation and are dominated by egotism because they are

---

[71]. S.S. Rāghavachār,VTV. No.111,p.26.

Rarest Archiver

overpowered by lust and anger. As they do not comprehend the import of the śāstras, they become robbers of the śāstras. They steal Brahman, are bereft of all ānanda and their minds are unripe. They perceive only attributelessness and do not ascribe excellence to Brahaman. The destiny of these persons who are formed of darkness is darkness itself. How can the relation of identity with the Supreme in the form, "I am he" be tenable, when the Supreme is different in essential nature and in genus, according to all Srutis and from the standpoint of value.[72]

Such soul considers itself identical with Visnu. The Ch. Up. Bh. gives a very good description of this proud attitude. The soul which is inimical to Viṣṇu, driven by pride says 'I am Brahman,' the world is unreal,' 'I am perfect and powerful,' 'the world is without God,' and , finally, 'the world is not supported by Viṣṇu.' (Ch. Up. Bh.VI,8-9). Madhva compares this proud attitude of man to the evil deed of theft. A king punishes an ordinary theif; how much more will he punish a person who tries to steal the very kingship from him? In the system of Madhva, this pride is the greatest evil a man can commit, and obstinacy in this attitude will infallibly lead him to hell. Men blinded by desire, anger etc. give themelves up to their 'egos.' (ibid. VI. 16- A king punishes an ordinary thief, how much more will he not punish a person who tries to steal the kingship (Cf.also VTV.No. 220-222).How such wicked souls are given over to egotism: VTV. No. 223).[73]

In his AV, Madhva says that the Jīva cannot remain without sin as long as it is in 'Saṁsāra.' Even those jñānis who have begun to produce fruits are also subject to sin (cf.AV. III,4,28). The heavy burden of sin is accumulated all

---

72. S.S. Rāghavachār, VTV, No.223,pp.48-49.
73 Puthiadam, Op.Cit.,pp. 269-270.

Rarest Archiver

through man's transmigratory existence. Jayatīrtha would say that a man cannot but commit certain mistakes of rules and regulations and one cannot avoid fully the negligence that come from 'mans' speech and body.

Bondage is partly cosmic and material reality that originates from Viṣṇu. This bondage produces in man evil attitude and actions. So all these make the soul to feel that it is independent from Viṣṇu and identical with him. The root cause of all these attitudes of soul is positive ignorance (avidya) that comes from Supreme Brahman. Thus the liberation from bondage would mean liberation from 'moral sinfulness,' the material substance that veil the truth of reality from humanbeings. Desire, anger, attachment, pride etc, are causes of evil (Jayatīrtha call this theory "Svabhāvajñāvāda.' The positive ignorance which hides the real nature of Viṣṇu and also the dependent nature of soul from the soul, is not an illusory reality(mithya) but a positive reality coming to the soul from the 'independent Viṣṇu).[74]

In Madhva's system, bondage differs from soul to soul. In the concept of bondage, there is difference between a soul destined for liberation and a soul destined for transmigration in this world forever. The bondage for liberation is destructible and the bondage of trasmigration is industrictible. According to Madhva, some souls are good by their very nature and others are wicked. The 'asura' souls or the souls destined to go to hell are wicked by nature and these souls manifest their inner wickedness externally. For Madhva, the actions good or bad that the souls perform really affect their inner reality. Thus Madhva's concept is that we have to be liberated from desire, anger, attachment, merits

---

[74]. Ibid.,p.271.

Rarest Archiver

and demerits, from our two material bodies and finally from the positive ignorance by which Viṣṇu has covered us from the beginning.

2.31.2.THE SOURCE AND NATURE OF LIBERATION(MUKTI OR MOKṢA):

According to Madhva philosophy, 'Māyā' is said to be the mysterious will of the Lord (BS.Bh. I,4,25). Viṣṇu is full of grace (prasāda). As he provides bondage, so also he provides the release to the soul through his grace. He creates this physical world for the souls' bondage and as a training ground for their release. Through this ordeal every souls is destined to pass through. Viṣṇu is Satyasmikalpa, so none can question his will. Though this way of bondage and release is painful for the souls, it is the will and pleasure of the Lord that they should undergo such a painful way. This will and pleasure of the Lord is called lila (Playful activity or divine sport). Viṣṇu is aptakāma (one whose wants already are fulfilled); thus he has no purpose in his creative activity exept out of his overflowing bliss or ānanda he destines the souls for their bondage and liberation.

2.31.3.VIṢṆU, THE GIVER OF LIBERATION.

The Dvaita Vedānta teaches that it is Viṣṇu who creates, supports the universe; he destines the union of soul and matter; he veiles the soul by the positive ignorance and it is also his work to free the souls from the fetters of transmigration (VTV. no.109-111). By bondage two elements are im plied, 1.Ignorance, which veils the souls (ajñāna or avṛti), and 2. The union of the soul to matter (bandha). Viṣṇu is the origin of these two elements. The knowledge (jñāna) and the liberation (mukti) are most necessary for the souls to be freed from their bodies. Madhva holds that Viṣṇu is the giver of both knowledge and liberation (mukti). In the terminology

Rarest Archiver

of Jayatirtha, Viṣṇu alone is the jñānōpadāna- producer of knowledge and liberator of good souls.

Madhva says, "Without the favour of Viṣṇu, liberation cannot be attained. To the ignorant Viṣṇu grants knowledge to the knower release and to the released he grants bliss (Cf. VTV.no,105, AV.no.15). He also understands that the penitence and purification (liberation also) are granted to the mukti-yōgyas souls. There are two types of releases, the temporary and the final. According to his teaching, there is no final liberation for the soul from the bonds of matter in the temporary release and as a result, the soul that accumulates the merits in the past lives is once again born in one of the two worlds mentioned above and remains in the same state until it has exhausted all its accumulated merits; and again, the soul returns to its earthly existence once its merits are exhausted.

2.31.4.'LIBERATION' IN MADHVA.

'Liberation' is the highest end or 'Liberation is the highest of the ideal of life of man in Madhva. 'Dharma, artha and kāma are not abiding, only mokṣa is abiding. Therefore an intelligent man must seek to attain that. The ends like dharma are transient and freely mixed with sorrow. Therefore, they do not bring about supreme happiness. Only moksa is the highest bliss to be aimed at by those who are wandering in samsāra (mundane world).[75]

'Liberation' has both a negative and positive aspects of meaning and liberation would mean freedom from something and attainment of something in Madhva. The negative connotation of the souls, liberation would mean, that the soul which is the reflection of Viṣṇu and which has the nature of being, bliss

---

[75]. S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV.Nos.102-104, p.25.

Rarest Archiver

and consciousness is liberated from the extraneous elements that presently cover the soul. The positive liberation or the release of the soul would mean that the soul attains its 'real' and 'original' nature in all its purity and fullness. It is through the grace or favour of Viṣṇu when the soul's, veil of ignorance is removed, the soul's hidden essential nature is manifested and the soul comes to its own knowledge and ānanda (bliss). When Viṣṇu removes the veil of ignorance from the soul, the soul becomes conscious of its innate similarity to Viṣṇu.

According to Madhva, "Having approached near the blissful One, he (the released soul) shaped according to his desire, wanders(in delight) through these worlds, eating the food of his desires; he abides singing the Saman chants. Having come to the Supreme Light he stands revealed in his own natural form. There he moves about eating, playing and rejoicing with either women or chariots or with selves liberated along with him or those liberated in earlier epochs.[76] This concept of released soul seems to be 'anthromorphic' (the eternal sensual enjoyment of various pleasures) in Madhva.

In its release, the soul is in intimate union with the Lord; and its complete going to the Supreme Being has taken place; the released soul possess the positive bliss that is obtained only through the prasāda (grace) of Hari (here there is the 'theistic' view of the released souls in Madhva).[77]

2.31.5.MEANS TO REACH LIBERATION (SĀDHANAVICĀRA):

Here the 'means' (sādhana) for the liberation of the souls only refer to the souls that are fit for release and all other destined transmigrating souls in this world or souls fit to go to hell are not fit to make use of these means of

---

76. Ibid.,VTV, nos. 277,279, p.61.
77. Puthiadam, Op.Cit.,p.279.

Rarest Archiver

liberation. The transmigrating and damned souls, by their very nature and of their karma are not capable of reaching the final bliss of mokṣa. The activity of work, the way of knowledge and finally the way of devotion of the Lord from man's side would be important as the means of his soul's release in Madhva's understanding. Man's means of his soul's release are called, 1.Vairāgya (non-attachment), 2. Karma - mārga (the way of works), 3. Jñāna-mārga (the way of Knowledge), 4. Bhakti-mārga (The way of devotion).

The non-attachment (Vairāgya) to the body, bodily pleasures and cravings of body is recognized as the primary first step in Sādhana in Madhva. According to Madhva, an aspirant cannot attain moksa until he realizes his utter dependency of own body, kith and kin, worldly wealth and his own self --on God alone. Thus the aspirant in his way of liberation should have a sense of aversion towards the perishable earthly pleasures and turn his mind always on the Supreme Being-God.

The way of Works (Karmamārga or karmayōga) would require the aspirant to perform his action as imposed on him according to his caste or state of life (Varna-āśrama). His mind has to be devoted to God and he should be without any desire for the fruits or the results of his actions (Niṣkāma karma or disinterested action). Here it means that the soul (jīva) in its path of releasement should perform all the prescribed actions and should avoid the prohibited actions also. An action to be salvific, it should be performed without any desire for its fruits. When obligatory actions are performed without any desire for their fruits, then the aspirant will not have rebirth in samsāra. According to the Dvaita system, knowledge and action (Jñāna-pūrva-karma) go hand in hand and the action is subordinate to knowledge. The desireless action

Rarest Archiver

(Niṣkāma karma) leads an aspirant to knowledge (jñāna) which further leads him to Bhakti (devotion) and ultimately that results in the vision of the Supreme Being.

In the concept of Jñāna mārga, Madhva maintains that the knowledge is superior to action and therefore it has the greater efficacy in our search for liberation (mukti). The true knowledge consists in Madhva system, when the aspirant is convinced of Viṣṇu as the independent reality and he as a reflection (pratibimba) to what is reflected (bimba). In his essential nature, action and knowledge, the aspirant is dependent on Viṣṇu. And again he is required to have knowledge of the different grades of gods and what type of devotion to be given to them after Viṣṇu is also most necessary for liberation. Thus this type of intellectual knowledge leads the aspirant to devotion (Bhakti). It is through the study of Holy Scriptures under the able teacher (guru) by the caste qualified persons with moral disposition, the knowledge of Viṣṇu and soul' mukti is attained.

The jñānamārga (the way of knowledge) consists of three steps, namely:1.Śravaṇa(study or hearing of the Śruti by a competent guru) 2.Manana(deep reflection on the truths heard from guru of Śruti) and 3.Nididhyāsana(steady and continuos meditation on the attributes of God or the direct experience or vision of God is experienced).

In the attainment of true knowledge of God is the fourth exercise which is called 'Upāsana' which according to Madhva takes the form of either remembrance (smṛti) or of meditation (dhyāna). In Madhva, Upāsana signifies the reverential approach of the soul to the Lord. The soul desires to honour and serve the Lord. But it wants to know the grandeur of the Lord. The soul first of all knows the Lord as the author of all, the author of one's body, the father of all. Out of this

Rarest Archiver

consciousness is born personal attachment and engagement. The soul asks itself: What should I do? The sacred texts answer; continuous upāsana. (AV.III, 3.5).[78]

Thus according to Madhva, the person who practices the Upāsana on the right lines and under the able and proper guidance of the teacher, would eventually attain God-realization. There are three orders of Upāsana, namely, 1.Internal, 2.Outward, and 3.All pervasive. These three orders of Upāsanas are exercised in accordance to one's individual different (internal) capacities. Some individuals meditate God as all pervasive one, some others meditate him to be in their hearts, and others meditate him in the external pratikas, images etc.

As regards the Pratikōpāsana (worship of Viṣṇu's image), Madhva maintained that the proper way of meditation(upāsana) is to meditate on Brhaman as being present in that image and not that image as Brahman. One should not identify the Supreme Being with anything, which is not Brahman at all. According to his interpretation, the Supreme Being should always be meditated upon as "Brahman", i.e., as being endowed with infinite attributes and as transcending all. B.N.K Sharma says,"No Christian missionary could have been more critical of the profanity of idol worship than Madhva has been here".[79]

Teaching about the concept of the Bimbōpāsana, Madhva maintains that this type of Upāsana is higher than pratikōpāsana meditation. The jīva(soul) here has eternal and intimate relation of constant dependence on Brahman for its being and becoming. The relation of soul to Brahman is indissoluble and perpetual (svarūpasaṁbandha). The intrinsic dependence of soul on Brahman is rooted in the very essence of

---

78. Ibid.,PP.290.
79. B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy, p.412.

Rarest Archiver

the soul with its essential characteristics of consciousness and ānanda(bliss) that becomes fully manifested in mokṣa. Each individual is the reflection (pratibimba) of God who is reflected (bimba). When each individual soul realizes this visualization of the Lord in his bimba(reflected) then the final release is possible. "The "Bimba" form is defined as that form of the Lord in the heart of which the Jīva is the Pratibimba.[80]

2.31.6.THE WAY OF DEVOTION (BHAKTI-MĀRGA):

According to Madhva, both knowledge (jñāna) of Viṣṇu and devotion (bhakti) to Viṣṇu exist together and between them there is certain mutual interdependency. Viṣṇu is perfect of all beings therefore he is dearer to humans than all other beings. Bakti is a steady and continuous flow of love of Viṣṇu that cannot be obstructed by any hurdles or hindrance. This kind of love for God transcends our selfish loves. Before the love of God no kith and kin or possessions can come. Our selfless love is based on the all-surpassing majesty of God because he is the abode of all perfection.

The power of bhakti is so great 'that the devotees are in Viṣṇu and Viṣṇu in them. The devotees are under the full control of the Lord and the Lord in his turn is under the control of the devotees. Madhva and Jayatīrtha tell us that the devotee is conscious of his dependence on Viṣṇu, whereas the non-devotee is not conscious of his dependence. There are different types and grads of bhakti(devotion). Bhakti differs from one class of soul to another. The gods and the Apsaras manifest their devotion to Viṣṇu through their love (snēha) or with the attitude of 'a woman in love with her husband' (kāmitvēna). Bhakti can take different shapes in the soul: the

---

80. Ibid.,p.416.

Rarest Archiver

humble attitude of a servant to his Lord, of a son to his father, of a disciple to his teacher. From the point of view of the intensity of devotion Madhva distinguishes between the higher, middle and lower types of bhaktas(uttama, madhyama and adhama(these different types and grades of bhakti depend upon the intrinsic 'adhikāratva' of the souls. Devotion is directed not only to Viṣṇu but also to other superior beings like Laksmi, Brahma and Vāyu. Such bhakti is salvific when practiced in the right way. Viṣṇu alone is the absolute being and absolute devotion can be practiced only towards him. Devotion to Vāyu is specially recommended because Madhva considers god Vāyu as a sort of 'mediator' who leads the souls to Viṣṇu. Bhakti is both the means to liberation and the very goal. Bhakti leads us on the path of knowledge and obtains for us Viṣṇu's grace. But it is also the end or goal. Even the liberated jīva, is filled with bhakti. He grows in bhakti. Its very essence is felicity. Now bhakti is no more a means. But neither the true knowledge of Viṣṇu nor real bhakti towards him is possible without the elective of favour of Viṣṇu.

In the pluralistic, ontological theology of Madhva, there is also the need of a respect or love towards oneself. He terms it 'svādara': self respect or legitimate desire for one's own good. If a person does not desire his own good, then there will be no desire for 'mukti' too in him (AVIII 3.103). One's respect for oneself and the devotion one has for the gods must find their fulfillment in one's highest devotion to the Lord. The progress toward liberation is a step by step ascent to Viṣṇu through the various grades of beings. 'Bhakti' is the force that sustains the movement.[81]

2.31.7.THE FAVOUR OF VIṢṆU (PRASĀDA):

---

[81]. Puthiadam, Op.Cit.,PP.298-301.

Rarest Archiver

It is through the three mārgas such as: 1.karma mārga(the way of action), 2. Jñāna mārga(the way of knowledge) and the 3. Bhakti mārga(the way of devotion) the soul is released and moved by these margas Viṣṇu shows his favour(prasāda or prīti) to the souls. It is the favour of Viṣṇu alone that ultimately grants release or liberation to soul and without his favour or his good will no release is possible. Madhva uses the words like 'prīti' 'anugraha' for the commonly used word 'prasāda' The term 'prasāda' means a benevolent disposition from a higher or superior person to the lower or humble person who humbly acknowledges being so and through such benevolent attitude the expected result takes place in the lower person. This same principle is applied as regards the favour of Viṣṇu whereby his prasāda is the ultimate cause of liberation or removal of positive ignorance in the soul. Thus the favour of Viṣṇu is a positive entity in the soul and the liberation that is caused by the grace of Viṣṇu is real in the soul. When the soul acknowledges the superiority of Viṣṇu, then it receives Viṣṇu's prasāda (grace and work play important role in Madhva system).

2.31.8.THE FUNCTION OF THE SAVING FAVOUR OF VIṢṆU:

Viṣṇu causes the beginningless bondage, so also it is he who releases soul from its bondage and gives it the final liberation; and it is through the soul's immediate knowledge of Viṣṇu (brahmasākṣātkāra) its release is attained. Viṣṇu, because he is omnipotent, he alone can destroy the bondage of the soul. According to Madhva, the saving favour of Viṣṇu is exercised in three ways. In the first instance Viṣṇu grants to the ignorant the knowledge of him and secondly he gives release from ignorance to the knower of him, and finally grants the bliss or ānanda to the liberated or released jīvas. So here it is clear that though a soul may be released from

Rarest Archiver

ignorance but may remain without the final bliss (ānḍanda). The soul is united to its source, that is Viṣṇu, because his activity of liberating the soul is essentially his action. Through his grace alone Viṣṇu liberates the souls that are fit for liberation and strength for their ānanda (bliss).

2.31.9.THE STATUS OR THE CONDITION OF THE RELEASED SOULS:

Madhva shows the distinction between the released souls and Viṣṇu. In his Viṣṇu-Tatva-Vinīrṇaya he says, "Just as pure water poured into pure water acquires community of nature with it, even so the man of wisdom shakes off merits and demerits and as a pure soul attains to the highest similarity. The Lord is the support for the immortals i.e., liberated souls.[82]

So the soul by its release does not identify with Viṣṇu but it has its union with Viṣṇu in its highest similarity and union. In the state of the release the mind of the soul is in tune with the mind of Brahman (Cf. VTV.no.294). The released soul is completely dependent on Absolutely Independent Brahman.

As regards the bodies of the released souls, Madhva has the opinion that the released souls possess head, body, hands and feet that are formed out of knowledge and felicity (great happiness or bliss). These released souls are free of their every defect and play is their only activity. The spiritual body of Viṣṇu is formed out of pure knowledge and the released souls because they possess the spiritual faculties, they also come to know the pure form of Viṣṇu. The released souls only in order to keep themselves in the state of bliss or ānanda, engage in eleven activities. Only their law of inner bliss regulates and rules their actions and no external laws can

---

82. S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV.Nos.282-283, p.62.

Rarest Archiver

bind them. The released souls are active and free and they have pure desire of Viṣṇu.

Madhva maintains a gradation in the bliss (ānandatāratamya) and status of the released souls and this shows the difference in nature-fitness (svarūpa yōgyata) of each individual soul. There are different classes of souls and as well as there is the distinction in nature that exists between the same classes of souls. As the differences and the nature between souls are beginningless and without end, so also there is the difference and distinction between the released souls. Dvaita Vedānta teaches that the means to achieve release used by gods and humans differ according to their proportion. The god Brahma, who is the highest among the mukti yōgya souls, seems to occupy the first place in the hierarchy of the released souls.

Madhva also speaks of another way of expressing the idea of gradation among the released souls in his Vaiṣṇava doctrine namely, four other grades in the state of souls' release. The released souls are ranked in an ascending order in as much as they are in Viṣṇu's world (salōkya), or so close to him (sāmipya), or similar to Viṣṇu (sarūpya), or united to him (sayūjya). In 'salōkya-mukti state', the released souls are admitted into the world of Viṣṇu, which means Vaikuntha. In the second stage, these souls remain in the proximity and presence of Viṣṇu and are servants of the him. In 'sarūpya-mukti state (similar to Viṣṇu) the desire of the souls are to be assimilated to Viṣṇu; and this is realized because of the gift of a body similar to that of him. In this resemblance state the released souls experience a special happiness or ananda. In sayūjya-mukti (union to Viṣṇu) the released penetrate into the body of Viṣṇu; and their special bliss consists in this close union and this fact they know by means

Rarest Archiver

of the very divine faculties given to them. Madhva understands that at this stage the released are united to the body of the Lord and their happiness here is neither material nor purely selfish.

Can there exist inequality, jealousy and strife among the released souls? The Madhvas are quite conscious of this objection and they hold that since the released state is a state of pure bliss there should not be any place for dissatisfaction, discontentment and rivalry among them. In the liberated state each soul looks at Viṣṇu and each feels that the Lord is turned towards it just as the sun looks at each of the beings. Because the released souls now know Viṣṇu directly, they are defectless, faultless and help the other souls. In the attainment of bliss, the superior and the higher souls have been of help to the lower and inferior souls.

Because of their devotion and love towards Viṣṇu, the liberated souls affect their attitude to other liberated souls as well. The liberated souls in the hierarchic order reflect the perfection of Lord. The inferior souls are reflections of Viṣṇu and of the superior souls as well. The higher souls direct the lower grade souls. Moreover it is the vision of Lord that fills each soul with bliss according to its capacity and fitness. Thus according to Madhva, the released souls remain in unchanging ananda united to God and in harmony with the other liberated souls for all eternity. In conclusion we can say that according to Madhva, the contamination of matter is bondage and freedom from it is the liberation of the soul. The soul's true nature consists in satta, citta, and ānanda (bliss) and these will be manifested when the soul is liberated.

To achieve this one has to make a beginning with vihitakarma that is to say, discharge his rightful duties,

Rarest Archiver

obtain jñāna, i.e. enlightenment, practice bhakti (devotion), sāma, dāma etc., self-culture, and moral purity and finally śaraṇāgati, i.e. complete dedication of every thing that one does at the feet of God including himself. The Dvaita provides a highly ethical and humane social life with a spiritual goal. Following Śrī Madhvāchārya, good many eminent scholars and saints have enriched Dvaita Vedānta. Śrī Jayatīrtha, Śrī Vyāsarāja, Śrī Vādirāja, Śrī Raghuttama, Śrī Vidyādhīsa, Śrī Rāghavēndra and many other saint-philosophers have enriched Dvaita literature.

A popular movement of Haridāsa led by Purandaradāsa has produced a rich literature of Kannada songs with the melody of music and the depth of devotion. Purandaradāsa, Kanakadāsa, Vijayadāsa, Gopaladāsa, Jagannathadāsa are some of the great names in this field. These have made rich contribution to bhaki literature and carnatic music.[83]

---

[83] K.T. Pandurangi, Philosophy of Madhvāchārya, a brief outline, pp.27-28.

Rarest Archiver

CHAPTER--3.

THE CONCEPTION OF BRAHMAN AS ' ETERNAL THOU' (PURUSHOTTAMA-SUPREME).

3.0.INTRODUCTION:

In the life of humanity, God or Brahman is a significant factor. The great majorities of the people across the world and especially in this multi-religious country of ours people are theists and they do believe in God and His Supremacy. In the system of Dvaita Vedānta of Śrī Madhvācārya, God or Brahman has an important place and He plays prominent part in the life and activities of the people. Madhva always considers Brahman in relation to Jīva (Soul) and the Jagat (World). According to him, God is transcendent and He is immanet as well. Brahman pervades the entire universe through His omnipresence; He is the Satta or the ground for the existence of jīvas (souls) and the world of beings. The souls (jīvas) and the world of beings depend on Brhaman for their sustenance. The contention of Dvaita Darśana is that Brahman is the goal or end of their lives and it is through Him alone that their liberation (mukti) from this world of pāpa (sin) and suffering (dukkha) is to be attained.

Madhvācārya identifies God or Brahman with Viṣṇu. Viṣṇu is Sarvōttama or Supreme. He is Lord and Superior to all others. He is our father, mother and preceptor. We need to direct our minds towards Him instead of wasting and worrying about petty things of this world. He alone is absolutely independent with regard to His svarūpa (nature), Pramiti (knowledge) and Pravṛtti (action). And everything else exists

Rarest Archiver

and acts according to the will of Viṣṇu. Madhva mainly quotes the Śruti and Ithihāsa Purāṇa passages to elaborate the above points. The Sacred literature in its entirety declares Viṣṇu's supremacy. Madhva teaches that all names are the names of Viṣṇu. As all rivers flow towards the sea so also all the names convey Purushottama (Supremacy) of Viṣṇu. While discussing about Viṣṇu's Purushottamatva (supremacy) of Viṣṇu,Madhva repeatedly stresses Viṣṇu's Guṇaparipūrṇatva and Nirdōshatva and maintains that Viṣṇu's auspicious attributes are limitless in number; and each of his attributes is also limitless.[1]

The conception of God in Dvaita Vedānta is personal. But this 'Personal' conception of God does not limit Viṣṇu's transcendent power and glory. Viṣṇu is Supreme Reality and he possesses all excellences such as infinite knowledge, bliss, power and compassion etc. It is he who manifests, maintains and withdraws this entire Universe. He controls this universe in all its aspects. Madhva teaches that it is because of Viṣṇu's grace (prasāda) that the Jīvas (self-soul) and matter (jada) exist. He alone is Independent (Svatantra) and all else are Dependent Reals (Asvātantra or Paratantra). The world of matter and the jīvas (souls) are subordinate and dependent on Viṣṇu. Only God alone exists independently. He is one without the second. Viṣṇu, according to Madhva, manifests himself in various forms. He incarnates himself as avatāras and is present in sacred images. Visnu is the efficient cause of the universe and not its material cause. Thus Viṣṇu is Supreme (Purushōttama) and he is infinite. We cannot grasp Viṣṇu completely by our finite intellect because we are finite human selves. But Madhva maintains that Viṣṇu is not wholly

---

1. K.T. Pandurangi, Philosophy of Śrī Madhvāchārya a brief outline, PP.6-7).

Rarest Archiver

unknowable. Through the study and means of Vēdas (Scriptures), Viṣṇu can be apprehended to some extent.

As regards Viṣṇu's attributes, there is no fundamental distinction between him and his attributes; and this is understood by the principle called 'Viśēṣa'. In his Viṣṇutattvavinīrṇaya, Madhva holds that it is through the grace of God alone that the self (jīva) can be redeemed and everything else is only a means to it. The opening verse of Viṣṇutattvavinīrṇaya is the verse of adoration to the transcendent perfection of Nārāyaṇa, the supreme Reality.[2]

Madhvācārya writes in his Aṇubhāṣya or Sarvaśāstrārtha Sangrahaḥ:"Sarvadōsojjhitastasmad bhagvān purusōttamaḥ ukta guṇascaviruddha stasya vedena sarvasaḥ"-Bhagavān Purusōttama, therefore, is free from all flaws. All His attributes declared by the Vēdas are non-contradictory in every way.[3] This adoration is an indication to an end in himself who is Viṣṇu. The supremcacy of Viṣṇu and the supremacy of the pathway of devotion to him are the two main foundations in the structure of Dvaita Vedānta that Madhva expounded.

3.1.MADHVA'S PHILOSOPHY OF GOD:

"Śrīman-Madhva-mate Hariḥ parataras styam jagat, tattvato bhēdo, jīva-gaṇa, Harer anucara, nicocca-bhāvam gataḥ, muktir naija-sukhānubhutir, amala bhaktis ca tat-sādhanam akṣadi-tritayam pramānam, akhilamānayaika-vēdyo Hariḥ".

Madhva teaches that Viṣṇu is the highest God, the world is real and the difference between God and soul does actually exist; all the living beings are dependent upon Viṣṇu, and they are divided into higher and lower classes; the salvation is in the soul experiencing its own joy from nature; the means

---

2. S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV.No.1,p.1.
3. S.S.Rāghavachār,ŚrīMadhva'sAṇubhāṣya,(Dharmapraksah,1973), p.31.

Rarest Archiver

to attain salvation is pure love of God; means to knowledge are sensory perception, inference and holy tradition; Viṣṇu is to be perceived in his nature through all the holy scriptures, and only through them(The memorial-verse which summerizes the quintessence of Madhv's philosophy in nine points(nava prameya-ratnāni), is quoted by Baladēva Vidyābhūṣaṇa at the end of his Pramēya-ratnāvaḷi. The same author gives another verse almost exactly similar in its contents at the beginning (stanza I, 8) of his work.[4]

3.2.THE NATURE OF GOD.

3.2.1.DEFINITION OF GOD OR BRAHMAN:

God is the being that effectuates creation, preservation, destruction and governance of the world, knowledge, ignorance, bond and salvation (on BDS. I, 1, 2). It is the one what is perfect and makes everything else perfect (bṛmhati bṛmhayati ca, on B.S. II, 3, 5, cf. Atharvaśira-Up 4). It is the one in which all perfections are present in the highest perfection (bṛhanta hy asmin guṇa" ity sruteḥ, BS-Nyāyavivaraṇa I, 1).[5]

3.2.2.BRAHMA - VIṢṆU- NĀRAYAṆ:

Madhva came forward to prove that Brahman, who is spoken of in Upaniṣhads, is none else than Viṣṇu of Vēdas and so the first point he proved is the identity of Brahman with the Vishṇu of Vēdas (Br.Soo.Bhāṣhya 1-1-1).

Another favorite word of Madhva is Nārāyaṇ. Madhva has chosen the word Nārāyaṇ for many reasons. That word fully expresses all that Madhva wanted to say about God. In fact,

---

4. Glasenapp, Op.Cit.,PP.68, 82.
5. Ibid.,p.101; B.N.K.Sharma, Teachings,p.110; Bannanje Govindāchārya, Madhvāchārya, Trans. K.Krishnamurthy & Upādhyaya,(Udupi:PejavarMutt,1984),pp.24,25;C.M.Padmanabhachārya, Op.Cit.,pp.146-147.

Rarest Archiver

that word Nārāyaṇ speaks of absolute perfectness and poorṇatva of God. Madhva's God is ALL -FULL and His God-ness or God-hood consists in His being completely and absolutely full in all respects. According to him Para-Brahman of Vēdāntin is nobody else but Viṣnu proclaimed in Vēdas as the Highes God (Ṛigvēda X-82 - 1-6).Vēda-Vyās's two Sootras (Aphorisms) - "Sa, Vishṇu rahahi" and " Tam, Brahmētyachakhate" the 2 sūtras of Daivee Meemaṅsa proclaim in clearest terms that Vishnu and Brahman are identical.[6]

3.3.VIṢNU IS THE CENTRAL TEACHING OF VĒDAS:

According to Madhva, Viṣnu is the central teaching of Śruti and Smṛti; and if we question the Holy Scripture about God we get the answer, "The word God is only applied to Viṣnu"(brahma-śabdam ca Viṣnav eva)[7] Vāsudēva etc.

3.4.VIṢNU IS ŚRUTI-CENTERED:

Madhva's problem of Viṣnu (Brahman) is Scripture (Śruti) Centered; and in his BS.Bh.3.5, he teaches that only Śruti can give us the true knowledge of Viṣnu.

3.5.THE SACRED TEXTS(SADĀGAMAS):

In Madhva Vēdanta the primary content of the Vēdas (Sacred texts-Sadāgamas) is Viṣnu. Though Śiva is the highest god in many of the purāṇas yet Madhva tries to prove through his exegesis of the sacred texts (sadāgamas) the Purushottamattva or the Supremacy of Viṣnu. Everything in the Holy Scriptures refers to Viṣnu; thus, whatever names of Gods

---

6. Anu. Vyā. 1-1-81 ; Chh. Up. M. B. 1-1-1; Br.Up.M.B. 1-1-1; Alur Venkat Rao, Śrī Madhwāchārya's Poorna Brahma Philosophy, (Dharwar: Nava Jeevan Grantha Bhandar), PP.47-50.
7. BS.I, 1.1;Anuvy on BS.I, 1, 4, p.5b; Anuvy p.31a; Viṣnutattva p.17b, Brh.Up p.49b and Mahavijaya I, 50f; Glasenapp, Op.Cit.,PP.103,158. Madhva calls Viṣnu with different names such as: Hari, Nārāyaṇa (Aṇubhāshya, Ch.I.1;S.SRaghavachār, Aṇubhāshya, Ch.I.Ip.14; Puthiadam, Op.Cit.pp.92-93; Glassenap, Op.Cit.PP.103-106; S.S.Rāghavachār, Aṇubhāṣya, p.28, 39,43,48; Bananje Govindāchārya, Madhvāchārya, p.25.

Rarest Archiver

might have been used in the canon, they are all names of Viṣṇu. Viṣṇu is the one "from whom all Gods have their names.[8]

3.6.ATTRIBUTES OF VIṢṆU:

The sacred texts speak of Viṣṇu as endowed with many qualities and attributes such as: Svatantrya, Vijñāna, Ānanda, Aiśvarya and Satyam etc. That supreme Viṣṇu is independent and transcends birth and death.[9] Madhva quotes many scared texts to prove Viṣṇu's Saguṇatvam, his auspicious attributes and the ocean of qualities.[10] 'Satyam'-being, JÑĀNAM -knowledge, ĀNANDAM - bliss, etc. are the Upaniṣadic texts that refer to Brahman and posit qualities to Him. Madhva teaches that we can bring Viṣṇu's numerous attributes under 'sat' (absolute perfection and Nirdśa), 'cit', 'ānanda', 'Ātma', (All-pervasive (a-tata) and Viṣṇu's Lordship over all) which are four leading attributes of Viṣṇu. In his BS.Bh, Madhva speaks of the conception of Viṣṇu as "sarva - svatantra" (the Absolutely Independent Being) and all the attributes of Viṣṇu are comprehended in it.[11]

Madhva considers Viṣṇu (Brhaman -God) not as an Abstract principle but He is the divine person in the model of human person. Viṣṇu's personality is the sum total of his qualities;

---

8. Rgv.X, 82, 3; Katha.Up.i.2.15; BS. II.1.13; BS. Bh.I.1, 1; Bh.Gī.Bh.II, 45; Mbh.XII.350, 12; Bh.Gīta.XI.43; B.N.K. Sharma, Bhagavadgita Bhāṣya of Śrī Madhvācārya, (Bangalore: Anandatirtha Pratisthāna, 1989), pp.39-40, 28-29;Glasenapp, Madhva's Philosophy of the Viṣṇu Faith, pp.104-105; Puthiadam, Op.Cit., p.91.
9. S.S.Rāghavācar, VTV, Nos.454-455, p.94; Puthiadam, St.Thomas Aqrinas and Śrī Madhvācārya, (Madras: University of Madras, 1978), p.52.
10. BS.Bh.I, 2, 1-2; Ch.Up.3, 14, 4; Mund.Up.3, 1, 7 etc; S.S.Raghavachār, VTV.No 454, p.94; S.S. Raghavācār, Aṇubhāsya, Chpts, I, II &III, PP.23, 26, 29, 31&33; AV.I.1, 100; Puthiadam, Op.Cit., p.117, 118.
11. BS.Bh.III, 3, 18;Glasenapp, Madhva's Philosophy, p.109; S.S. Rāghavacār, Aṇubhāsya, Ch.I, 3, p.17; S.S.Rāghavacār, VTV.No.457; B.N.K.Sharma, Teaching, pp.120-121; T.P.Ramachandran, PP.76, 77.

Rarest Archiver

and as part of His being He is endowed with the faculties of cognition, activity and conation. Viṣṇu's essence is to be conscious, to think, to will, to experience like the human beings. As the divine being he controls and loves the world through his rational purpose (Cf.B.T.I.1.18).

3.6.1.VIṢṆU IS BEING(SAT, SATYAM):

Commenting on Brahma Sūtra, I.1.15, in his AV, Madhva writes that Mantravarṇa designates Viṣṇu alone as Satyam (being), jñānam (knowledge) and anantam (endless). Viṣṇu is called as Sat (Being) for He alone causes existence that is called Sadhvava.[12]

3.6.2.VIṢṆU IS KNOWLEDGE (JÑĀNAM, VIJÑĀNAM):

One of the clear teachings of Śruti is 'Viṣṇu is Sarvajña (Omniscient) and it is the epithet of the Lord; all other realities except Viṣṇu possess alphajñāna (only partial knowledge). The consciousness and omniscience of Viṣṇu can be proved because he is the sole cause for the existence of the world. The form of Viṣṇu is that of unmixed knowledge (najñānamisrajñānaḥ) i.e., He is of luminous form (Tejōrupaḥ).[13]

3.6.3.THE BLISS OF VIṢṆU (ĀNANDA):

In his AV and BSBh, Madhva rightly calls Viṣṇu as 'endless' (ananta), because Viṣṇu is the fullness of bliss (ānanda) and He is the plentitude of joy(AV.197; BSBh.I.2.9; Tattvadīpika .p.116). Viṣṇu's infinitude (anantatva) means his limitlessness of bliss. The Lord's greatness, perfection,

---

12. AV.I.1.190; Puthiadam, God, p.52.
13. BSBh. II.2.41; BSBh.II.2.41; III.2.16; BSBh, IV.2.29; Puthiadam, God, p.53;S.S. Rāghavachār, VTV.No.262-63,81, pp.57,18)

Rarest Archiver

Supremacy, and infinitude are expressed by such terms as 'Pūrṇatva', 'Nihsimatva', and 'Mahātmya'.[14]

3.7.VIṢṆU IS ETERNAL (NITYA) AND OMNIPRESENT (SARVAGATA):

Madhva teaches that Viṣṇu is beginningless and endless. He makes a distinction between the eternity of Viṣṇu and the eternity of other realities of beings. In his Katha. Up.Bh. Madhva distinguishes 'anāditva' from 'amṛtatva'. The world is said to be eternal like an overflowing stream (anādi pravahataḥ - pravahamitya) but Viṣṇu is said to be deathless (amṛtaḥ).[15]

3.8.THE LORDSHIP OF VIṢṆU (AIŚVARYA):

Pancarātras system considered the Lordship (Aiśvarya) as the quality of Viṣṇu but Madhva gives new meaning to the term. In his opinion all the attributes find their harmony in Viṣṇu and they owe to his Lordhsip. (BSBh.I.1.15; Cf.Di.; Up. Bh. P.15; Cf. Bh.Gī.Bh.II. 23-25; Bh.Gī.Bh. II.23-25). Madhva says that Aiśvarya of the Lord enables him to be active and yet unchangeable. Viṣṇu posses all wonderful powers (Vicitra Śaktiman).[16]

3.9.VIṢṆU IS THE INDESTRUCTIBLE AND ALL PERVASIVE:

In Madhva's opinion Viṣṇu is pervades the entire body and He is indestructible; no one is able to destroy theimperishable soul.[17]

3.10.VIṢṆU IS INVISBLE AND HAS UNIQUE POWER (AVYAKTA AND ACHINTAYA:

---

14. BSBh. I.2.15; Puthiadam, God, PP.53-54,125-26.
15. BSBh. II. 3.1-7; BSBh. II.3.22, 23; Puthiadam, God. PP.54-55,129-130).
16. BSBh. II.1.29; Puthiadam, God, P.54; Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP. 128-129).
17. Bh.Gi.II:17; B.N.K. Sharma,Bhagavatgīta Bhāshya, p.17.

Rarest Archiver

MYSORE

Madhva interprets the Bh.Gīt.II:25 as' because of Viṣnu's mysterious power, His nature is unman fest, unthinkable (in full) and unchangeable.[18]

3.11.VIṢNU IS THE SUPREME BEING AND ALL OTHERS ARE ENTIRELY DEPENDENT ON HIM:

Commenting on the Bh.Gī.VII:7, Madhva holds that Viṣnu is the highest one and there is nothing higher than Him.[19]

3.12.VIṢNU SUPPORTS ALL, IS EVERYWHERE, HE IS SUPREME AND HE IS REALIZED BY DEVOTION:

According to Madhva, Viṣnu supports all; He is everywhere. He is the supreme Lord and He can be realized only through Bhakti because the devotion is the highest among other sādhanas.[20]

3.13.VIṢNU IS ALL PERVASIVE BUT INVISIBLE:

The mediate knowledge of the Lord has been referred to by the term 'Pratyakṣavagamam' as leading to Viṣnu's direct percetion. In Madhva's opinion, though the Lord is everywhere, yet His form is unmanifest.[21]

3.14.VIṢNU IMPARTIAL TO ALL:

According to Madhva's teaching, one who is under the Lord's control without being alive to it, comes over again under His control with full consciousness of the fact by meditating on Him.[22]

3.15.VIṢNU IS THE KNOWER OF ALL AND HE IS PRESENT AT THE HEART OF ALL BEINGS:

Commeting on the Bhagavatgīta, Madhva maintains that Viṣnu is situated in everyone's heart. Viṣnu is both within all beings

---

18. B.N.K. Sharma Bhagavadgīta Bhāshya,p.33.
19. B.N.K. Sharma Bhagavadgīta Bhāshya, p.160.
20. Bh.Gi.VII: 22; B.N.K. Sharma Bhagavadgīta Bhāshya,p.189.
21. Bh.Gi.XI:4; B.N.K. Sharma Bhagavadgīta Bhāshya,p.194.
22. Bh.Gi, IX: 29; XII: 323,49; B.N.K.Sharma Bhagavadgīta Bhāshya,(pp.208,210-211).

Rarest Archiver

and outside of them all. He cannot be comprehended because He is subtle. He is knowledge and object of knowledge; and He is the goal of knowledge.[23]

3.16.VISNU IS THE CAUSE OF MEMORY, UNDERSTANDING AND ILLUSIONS; HE IS THE AUTHOR OF VEDAS AND BRAHMASŪTRAS; ALL VĒDAS CONVEY HIM:

In Bhagavadgīta, Kṛiṣna says, "I am seated in everyone's heart, and from Me come remembrance, knowledge and forgetfulness. By all the Vedas am I to be known; indeed I am the compiler of Vedānta, and I am the knower of the Vēdas. Madhva would explain in his Bhagavatgīta Bhāshya that the Vedāntas are the Brahma Mimāmsā Sāstra, which determines the meaning and important of the Vēdas. Visnu causes the understanding, memory and illusions of the living entities. The entire Vēda convey Him only, He Himself has written the Brahmasūtras; and He fully knows the purport of Vēdas.[24]

3.17.IS VISNU PERSONAL GOD?

Another question that is sometimes raised is whether Visnu (God) is personal of impersonal (G.T.II-25). Madhva teaches that God is not personal in the sense of having a material or prākṛta form. His personality has no physical apparatus. But He is personal in the sense of a conscious, willing, active personality with aparkṛta form. Therefore in Bhagavatgīta we see that the concept of God is monotheistic. There is one Supreme and Independent God (Visnu) who governs the entire universe in all aspects.

---

23. Bh.Gī.XIII: 15-18; B.N.K. Sharma Bhagavadgīta Bhāshya Adhyāya XIII, Texts, 15-18,p.259; K.T. Pandurangi, Essentials of Gītabhashya and Gītatāparya of Śrī Madhvācārya, (Bangalore: Akhila Bhārata Mādhva Mahā Mandala& Anandatīrtha Pratisthāna, 1987), p.33.
24. Bh.Gī.XV:15; B.N.K. Sharma Bhagavadgīta Bhāshya, Adhyāya,XV: 15. p.288.

Rarest Archiver

3.18.VIṢṆU IS KṢETRA AND KṢETRAJÑA:

Madhva holds that Viṣṇu is delineated as Kṣetra and Kṣetrajña. Śarīra is kṣetra and he who knows it is kṣetrajña (Bh.Gī.XIII.2. the Kṣetras are Laksmi, Prakṛti, Jīva, Mahat, Ahṁkara, Bhūtas, Indriyas and their objects,the mental states like joy,sorrow, etc, the body and mind (XIII:6,7; XIII:27; G.T,XIII.27). Kṣetarajña is God (Viṣṇu) in all contexts.[25]

---

[25]. K.T. Pandurangi, Essentials of Gītabhāshya and Gītatāparya, pp.35-37; For the complete Purushōmatva (Supremacy) of Viṣṇu Cf. Bh.Gī. XV: 1-9).

Rarest Archiver

CHAPTER–4

THE JĪVĀTMANS (THOUS – SOULS)

4.0.introduction:

The subject of our research here in this chapter is the Anthropology of Madhva or in other words how Madhva looks at man (Jīva) as man or man as concrete Body-soul composite being. According to him man is a being conditioned by his dependence on Brahman (God). Man is a finite, spiritual being who exists in a body or in bodies here and now. One of the evolutes of the matter is the body of man. He is a social being because he lives and exists amidst other human beings in a milieu and world in time and space. Therefore we call him as a member of his society. He is subject to birth and death and is an agent and enjoyer of the fruits of his acts. Man has to live in the midst of this world where social injustice, evils and inequalities exist. So the human situation is complicated and human existence itself becomes all the more complex one as we try to understand man in his relationship with Brahman, other human beings, living beings, and the universe. A sincere effort is made here as to enquire how Madhva looks at man – soul – body relationship and how he answers to the problem of man.

4.1.NATURE OF MAN (THE DEFINITION OF JĪVA):

As already mentioned above, man is a composite being composed of finite matter and spiritual substance. We need to examine the nature of man's component parts. Thus we begin with the examination of the soul's nature.B.N.K. Sharma holds that the metaphysics deals with the 'real' and 'apparent self'. David Hume had reduced the notion of 'self' to mere series of ideas or experiences that cannot be said to belong

Rarest Archiver

to any unifying foundation or inhering principle. The Nairātmyavāda of Buddhism too tells in the line of Hume's conclusion. When all the sciences fail to analyse the 'self', which is not amendable to them, Vedānta understands the 'self' as not open to reasoning but to the experience of the intuition. Madhva holds, it is by Sākṣyānubhava, the self is to be established. In his V.T.V 290, he defines the self as: "He who is only cognizable as "I" is called the Jīva. It is he that suffers and enjoys. It is he that is bound and that get liberated".[1] In Jayathīrtha in his Nyāya -Sudha says, " He who enjoys the happiness and suffers the ills of life, who is subject to bondage and release is the Jīva. He is indeed in a position to know himself in all his states as "I am".[2] Thus the Jīva is a permanent entity that always endures even in and through its changing states of experiences and consciousness.

4.2.ESSENCE OF SELFHOOD:

The souls are conceived in the system of Madhva as finite centres of conscious experience, each with a unique essence of its own. The essence of individuality is that one finite centre of experience cannot possess, as its own immediate experience, the experience of another(NS. P.507). Each self has a specific content of consciousness, reality, and bliss and constitutes a focalization(NS. P.633). Each soul has a dynamic uniquer personality endowed with the triple properties of will, cognition and activity.[3] The souls (Selves) are not formless beings or colorless points but atomic individuals with their own specific forms and lineaments. They have spiritual bodies of their own with appropriate organs (BS. Iv.

---

1. S.S.Rāghavacār VTV. No. 290. P.64.
2. B.N.K.Sharma,Philosophy.P.253;NS.P.507; T.P.Ramachandran, Op.Cit.,p.85-86.
3. NS. P.26; BT XI.23.54 - B.N.K Sharma, Philosophy, PP.253-254.

Rarest Archiver

4.10, 16 and BSPG. Vol. III, PP.790-94) and have names and forms which are beyond the knowledge of those still in bondage.[4]

4.3.THE BODY OF MAN:

The soul which is caught up in the human situation has both a gross and a subtle body. The external, sensible body which is born and that grows and dies is a gross body. The gross body principally is composed of earth. The other elements that are the products of matter are also found in the gross body. It has both external sense organs and faculties of action. According to Madhva, the soul possesses a new gross body at each of its birth according to the state of its past Karma (BSBH. II.4. 22, 23;). Hence, the situation of man as man arises when the finite spiritual soul, gross body and subtle body join together to form a single unit as man that is covered by positive ignorance.

4.4.MAN THE COMPOSITE BEING:

The soul, though before its liberation is somehow beginninglessly connected with matter (Prakṛti), it can exist in itself without any relation to the body which neither affects the intrinsic nature or the existence of the soul because the soul by itself is a complete substance. The soul has its role to play in the formation of the body and the subtle body can be some sort of a link between the spiritual soul and the gross body in Madhva philosophy.

4.5.THE SOUL IS ATOMIC IN SIZE:

In his BSBh, Madhva teaches that the soul is atomic in size and it dwells in the heart (BSBh.II. 3.19, 24; BSBh.II.2.34). The soul does not change its size when it passes from one body into anther body because if the soul

---

[4] B.N.K. Sharma, Philosophy, p.258.

Rarest Archiver

changes its size then through such a change we make the soul perishable (BSBh.II.2.35). The soul is not devoid of size, because what is devoid of size cannot exist. Thus what does not have size has no essence (svarūpa) and what does not have essence has no reality at all (BSBh.II.2.36).

4.6.THE SELF (JĪVA) AS THE KNOWER, DOER AND ENJOYER:

Madhva teaches that the Jīva is the subject of knowledge called Jñāta, agent of action called Karta and enjoyer of its fruit of action called bhokta. These three as real characteristics are present in the soul even at the time of its release from its bondage. The statements such as I (aham), 'I know this', 'I know that', indicate that the Jīva as a knower expresses itself through these statements. The common expression " I know myself", is a clear evidence to maintain that the self knows itself. At this juncture the self is both subject and object because of the presence of Viśeṣas. The self-knowledge becomes possible and this is self - luminosity (G.T.XIII.13).

4.7.PLURALITY OF SOULS AND THEIR SVARŪPA-BHĒDA OR SVARŪPA-VIŚEṢAS:

As a pluralist and realist Madhva holds that the souls have the difference as regards their number and character are concerned. Our daily earthly life shows us that every human being is unique in his own way though he may have some similarity with others. There is the intrinsic difference in the spiritual essence of all souls; and because of this type of difference among souls the souls perform actions that lead to the accumulations of varying variations in enjoyments, sufferings, character traits in their saṁsāra. This type of basic or innate nature (svarūpa-bhēda) of soul will persist in the state of soul's liberation as well. Because of this

Rarest Archiver

Svarūpa -bhēda, souls' numerical plurality, qualitative diversity and freedom of will are possible. Every soul as the reflection (pratibimba) of Viṣṇu has in him a modicum of essential features of Viṣṇu in varying degrees only in bondage and liberation.[5]

4.8.THE THREEFOLD HIERARCHY OF JĪVAS, SVARŪPA-TRAIVIDHYAM:

Madhva classifies the souls under three broad types on the basis of their intrinsic svarūpa or nature, based on their varying degrees of knowledge, power and bliss. This type of classification is known as svarūpa-traividhya based on the 'Svarūpabhēdavāda or Svarūpatāratamya. The three broad types or the tripartite classification of jīvas or jīvatraividhya are: 1. Muktiyōgya (salvable) souls; 2. Nitya saṁsārin (Ever - transmigrating) souls; 3. Tamogya (Damnable) souls.[6]

4.9.GODS & DEMONS:

The gods are finite spiritual substances who, immediately because of their 'karma' and mediately because of their nature have become gods. The gods themselves belong to different classes such as Braham, Śēṣa, Vāyu, Gāndharva, etc. to different castes since there are, 'Brāhmin, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra gods. They play a subordinate part in the work of 'creation; they have a presiding function to perform in the world. Many gods preside over man's senses and the objects of knowledge; and they also indwell in the medicinal herbs. Viṣṇu is the inner controller of all the gods. One can contemplate Viṣṇu in them in a special way; it is a sin to worship them because they should never be worshiped in themselves. The gods too themselves must seek and work of liberation. Between the gods and man the relationship is of 'guru' and disciple (AV.III, 4.248). At the order of Vāsudēva, they enter into the

---

5. B.N.K. Sharama, Philosophy, p.282.
6. Ibid., PP.300-304.

Rarest Archiver

souls of men and induce them to do good and evil (deeds) in accordance with their past deeds.

The demons are also finite spiritual beings and are not fit to reach liberation. They possess extraordinary powers and they can influence human life by possessing man etc. Usually their bodies are invisible, though they can take on human forms in order to lead bad man astray.[7]

4.10.THE RATIONAL BASIS FOR THE DOCTRINE OF SVARUPABHEDA TĀRATAMYA AND TRAIVIDHYA:

There are complex variations and differences that exist in the psycho-physical, spiritual and mental lives of beings (souls). Madhva explains about the empirical differences of selves (human, animal, plant, aquatic, and other species of life).[8] The final solution for difference of intrinsic nature, evils, inequalities in the world at all levels of beings, can only be found in the Madhva's theory of Svarūpabhēda Tāratamya (dehinam svabhāvaja).[9] In his AV.Madhva maintains that this cosmic scheme of gradation among souls is omnipenetrative running up and down the scale - from the highest of the gods to the vilest of friends (Cf. AV.iii, 4.41). And it is in relation to this theory of Traividyam of Madhva, the Hindu doctrine of Karma has force and meaning.[10]

4.11.SELF- LUMINOSITY OF JĪVAS:

Madhva admits that the individual jiva as a sentient being is self-luminous or Svāprakaśa. It is both knower (jñātṛ) and of knowledge (jñānasvarūpa). The self-luminosity of jīva is dependent on God and this makes the bondage possible (Gt.Xiii.13). The soul (Ātama) must be self-

---

7. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.326-328.
8. B.N.K Sharma, Philosophy, PP. 282-285.
9. Bh.Gīta.V.14; B.N.K.Sharma, Philosopy, PP.297-298.
10. B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy, PP. 298-299.

Rarest Archiver

intuiting. Through the agency of Viśēṣa Madhva divides consciousness from itself. The self-luminosity of jīva cannot be disputed, as there is the indubitable experience of the Self as 'I am'. This cannot be explained away as an experience by the mind, as the Logicians do. The Śrutis also establish Ātman to be an active knower, employing terms like Vijñātṛ with the suffix (tṛ) in the active sense.[11]

4.12.JĪVA-VIṢṆU RELATION:

Madhva teaches that the relationship of soul to Brahman is that of Similarity and of Dependency. The soul possesses the attributes such as existence (Sat), consciousness (Cit) and bliss of God and in this way it is similar to Him. It is completely dependent on God through its three aspects of Being (satta), knowing (pramiti) and acting(pravṛtti). The two-fold relationship of soul with God is employed with the figure of reflection called pratibimbatva thus is called Bimba-pratibimba-bhāva (reflection of the reflected) (ṚV.Vii,47,18). There are two kinds of reflections: 1.The conditioned reflection or reflection through a medium called Sōpadhipratibimba (Example of our face reflection on the surface of a mirror), 2. The unconditioned reflection or a mediumless reflection called Nirupādhi-pratibimba(The rainbow).[12]

Concerning the essential nature of the Jīva as the reflection of God, Madhva teaches three truths. They are: 1.The Jīva is similar (Sāmya) to God, 2.The Jīva is distinct from God and 3.The Jīva is dependent (adhīna) on God. Because the Jīva is the reflection (reflex) or an image- of God, it is indestructible and eternal.[13]

---

11. TP.i.1.1; VTNt, p.96b; B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy, pp.265-267.
12. BS.Bh.ii, 3.50;T.P.Ramachandran, Op.Cit.,PP.87-89.
13. Bh Gī, II, 19;Glasenapp, Op.Cit.,PP.136, 167.

Rarest Archiver

Just as the rainbow is completely dependent on the Sun, so also the soul is completely dependent on God, as the parts are dependent upon the whole. Madhva uses the metaphor as souls are sons, brothers or friends of God (BSBh.II, 3, 43). On account of the soul's similarity to God, Madhva calls them as parts (aṁsa) of God.[14] The soul-God relationship can be expressed through the images of the Father and Son; king and subjects, aṁsa- aṁsi relationship (Cf.NS.ii; GB, ii, 24).

Madhva interprets, 'I am Brahman (Aham Brahmāsmi) and 'that thou art (tat tvam asi) and holds that the jīva is similar to Brahman as 'tvami tadiya asi' and interprets that this text should be interpreted in relation to the inner ruler (antaryāmin) of the soul who is Brahman and the sacred texts proclaim this difference between Brahman and jīva (BSBh.II.4, 16). Though Viṣṇu is the antaryāmi of the jīva, He is not touched by the evil that is attached to Jīva(Cf. BSBh.III, 1, 17).

4.13.THE COMPLETE DISTINCTION BETWEEN VIṆṢU AND THE JĪVAS:

The reality of Jīva, which though it is similar to Viṣṇu, is completely distinct from Viṣṇu. In his VTV, Madhva says, "Nowhere do we see differences being generated by unreal adjuncts.[16] Madhva clearly assigns opposing attributes to Brahman and the Soul - "The supreme Self is absolutely independent, all knowing, all powerful, supremely blissful and ultimate. But the individual self is dependent on him, knows a little, has limited power, is miserable and is finite.[17]

---

14. Bh.Gīta tatp XV, 7, p.37b; Anuvyā p.37a; BhG.XV, 7. Glasenapp, Op.Cit., PP.135, 167.
16. S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV. Nos.366-367, p.77; Kath.Up.Bh.PP.14, 15.17; AV.I.1.96, 97, 100, 101; BSBh. I.2.8.11etc.VTV.no. 275.
17. Ibid.,VTV.P.60.

Rarest Archiver

All the examples given by the father teach in fact the reality of this distinction (VTV. No. 224 the Jīva and God are different and are distinguished always by differences of essential nature.[18]

4.14.THE JĪVA'S DIFFERENCE FROM GOD AND MATTER:

Madhva maintains that Jīva (Puruṣa or Ātman) as the spiritual as well as the active, positive, eternal and conscious reality (substance) is dependent on one infinite, conscious being that is Viṣṇu. Both Viṣṇu and Jīva are completely distinct from each other. The soul is different from matter and similar to God. Jīva belongs to the same class of Brahman namely, sentient substance (cētana dravya). But the Jīva is similar to Brahman only in kind, and not in degree. The Jīva has a form constituted of bliss and consciousness; and it occupies subtle and gross bodies, which are products of matter, or prakṛti. In the state of bondage the natural bliss of the soul is mixed up with a lot of pain.[19]

4.15.JĪVATMAN AND THE BODY OR JĪVAS AND BODIES:

The Jīvas are clothed with the material bodies when they are caught up in saṁsāra. The Jīvas have two types of bodies such as, the grosser body (sthūla Śarīra) and the body that is formed from the finer material (sukma or lingaśarīra). The body of the first type is the external or sensible body and it can be perceived with the sense organs; this type of body comes into existence at the time of birth and perishes at death. The body of the second type (sthūla śarīra) is principally formed of crude elements.[20]

---

18. S.S.Rāghavachār, p.49; VTV.nos.210, 181-188, PP.46, 40-41; VTV.no.266, p.59; B.N.K.Sharama, Philosophy, p.177; BSBh.II.31; Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.232-236.
19. T.P.Ramachandran, Dvaita Vedānta, p.83.
20. Glasenap, Viṣṇu Faith, p.133; BS.II, 4, 23; BS.II, 4, 22, 23;III, 1, 25.

Rarest Archiver

The connection between the soul and matter is beginningless (BSBh.II.4.22, 23). Madhva admits that a body may have more than one soul (abhimānijīva) (BSBh.III.1.25, 26). The positive ignorance (avidya) is a third material entity or body (kāraṇa -śarīra), which is connected with the soul from beginningless time till the time of release and it is a part of the 'tamōguṇa' of matter which conceals the real knowledge of Brahman from Jīva; it enchains the soul to the state of bondage. positive ignorance too is ultimately under the control of Viṣṇu and it is He who causes it to arise to enchain the soul to the bodies. Hence, the situation of man as man arises when a finite spiritual soul, gross body and fine body join together to form a single unit and when this whole composite is 'covered over' by ignorance.[21]

4.16.THE UNION OF JĪVA AND MATTER:

Madhva affirms that the Jīva in itself is knowledge, being and bliss and because of its past karma it itself gets united to the body (matter). In his BSBh, Madhva teaches that the union of Jīva with that of matter is beginningless (anādi) (BSBh.II.3.39). Jīvas depend for their bondage, karma on Viṣṇu. So, Viṣṇu alone is the reason and cause for the Jīva's union with matter. Thus Viṣṇu's līla or the divine play in the abundance of His bliss causes the jīva's bondage. Viṣṇu causes their bondage for the betterment and good of the Jīvas and to save all the good jīvas. Jīvas (souls) possess the karmic bodies since the beginningless (anādi) time. Viṣṇu is the primary cause of human existence and situation; and karma and the nature of Jīva is the secondary cause of human existence.[22] In the material life, the soul has its seat in the heart.[23]

---

21. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.237-238.
22. Ibid.,p.239.
23. BS.II.3, 24 f.; Glasenapp, Viṣṇu Faith, p.135.

Rarest Archiver

4.17. THEORY OF BONDAGE OF JĪVAS (SVABHĀVAJÑĀNAVĀDA):

Madhva teaches that the Jīva is in the state of its experience of duhkha or misery according to its innate nature that is called bandha or bondage. The Jīva's experience of misery (duhkha), its bondage (bandha) is all real. The immediate cause of the Jīvas' misery or bondage is its ignorance (avidya-ajñāna) about its relationship with its all-powerful Viṣnu. The Jīvas, in their ignorance, look upon themselves as self-derived which is called Avidya.[24]

Jīvātman becomes slave to body, senses, intellect and to their attractions, which is known as bondage. Madhva has therefore, held that the theory of Jīvajñānavāda or what may be called Svabhāvajñānavāda has to be accepted as the right explanation of the fact of bondage. According to it, finite selves are, in the last analysis, subject to the bondage of Prakṛti by the Will of God from time immemorial. This bondage is a reality and is by no means imaginary (avidyakalpita). It exits by the Will of God and is terminable by His Will. Without the grace of God there can be no Mokṣa for any one in the world even with all the power and potency of Jñāna.[25]

Hence, this ignorance or avidya of the relationship of jīva to God, leads it to its bondage; and this is called Svabhāva- ajñāna -vada (the theory that bondage is due to the jīva's ignorance of its nature as a being entirely dependent on the one independent reality, namely Brahman.[26]

Because of the wrong sense of self-conceit or abhimāna or independence, the Jīva is made to shrink or flinched of its personality; and the outcome is that it identifies itself with

---

24. B.N.K. Sharma, Teachings, p.99.
25. NS.p.26; B.N.K.Sharama, The Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries - A Critical Exposition,(New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal,1986),pp.56- 59.
T.P.Ramachandran, Op.Cit.,p.90.

Rarest Archiver

the physical body or matter resulting in its bondge of miseries. Only true knowledge of the soul's relation to God that can redeem it from this bondage.[27]

The all-powerful Viṣṇu, through his mysterious power called 'Māyā' (the mysterious will of the Lord: BSB 1.4.25) dupes the Jīva.[28]

4.18.DOCTRINE OF SALVATION - VIṢṆU IS THE GIVER OF LIBERATION:

Madhv's doctrine maintains that Viṣṇu is the Creator, Supporter of the Universe and He is the Cause for the Jīva's union to matter and its veiling by ignorance. In the same manner the work of Viṣṇu is to free the Jīva from the Shakles (fetters) of its transmigration (Cf. BSBh. I.1.2;AV.I.12). "He alone is, therefore, competent to release the souls (Cf. Kath.Up.i, 2.23;AV.i.1.1). In his AV, Madhva has argued a strong case for holding Divine grace to be the ultimate of Mokṣa for Jīvas's attainment of mokṣa.[29]

Correspondingly liberation or removal of bondage will imply two elements such as: 1.Jñāna (knowledge); 2.Mukti (liberation) that free the Jīva from its bondage to the matter. Madhva teaches that among the eight activities of Viṣṇu the first four are cosmic in character, such as, Creation, Support, Government, and dissolution of the World; and the other four activities are personal in character that affects the finite spiritual beings, such as, 1.Viṣṇu veils the jīvas by ignorance; 2. He binds the jivas to body

---

27. NS.p.26; B.N.K. Sharma, Philosophy, PP.273-274.
28. B.N.K. Sharma, Teachings, PP.97-98; Ibid.,p.100;T.P. Ramachandran, Op.Cit.,PP.91-92.
29. B.N.K.Sharama, The Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries, pp.58- 59.

Rarest Archiver

(matter); 3. He grants Jñāna (knowledge) and 4. He frees the jīvas from the bondage of matter.[30]

By the invocation and rembrance of Viṣṇu (Hari) Jīva can be purified itself. Final release of jīvas('Svarga') stands for temporary release; mukti or moksa stands for final release. Thus temporary release may not free the jīva once for all or finally from its jīva-body union. Here, it may mean that the Jīva, which accumulated merits in its past lives, takes birth in one of the worlds above and remains till it exhausts all the accumulated merits (BSBh.III.1.8.10). Thus once the merits are exhausted the jīva comes back to its earthly existence.[31]

4.19.LIBERATION IN MADHVA:

Liberation is the highest and ultimate end; and unmixed good of Jīva. Madhva says in his VTV, "Dharma, artha and kama are not abiding, only mokṣa is abiding".[32]

In liberation, the Jīva attains its original and real nature (knowledge and bliss—Jñāna and ānanda) in all its purity and fullness through the favour (prasāda) of Viṣṇu (Cf.Tat.Pr.BSBh.II.3.31; BSBh.II.3.31 cf. BSBh.II.3.31).

The Jīva at the state of its release attains the similarity to God when He removes the veil of ignorance from Jīva; and the Jīvas enjoys when it approaches the blissful One.[33]

---

30. S.S. Rāghavàchār, VTV.No.105, p.25; AV.15.
31. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, p.275.
32. S.S. Rāghavāchār, VTV, Nos, 103-104, p.25.
33. Kath.Up. p.17;BSBh.III.2.18; S.S. Rāghavāchār, VTV, Nos.277, 279, p.61; BSBh, IV.4.10;BSBh.IV.4.15; I.Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, p.277.

Rarest Archiver

Mukti or liberation is Jīva's complete attainment of Viṣṇu like an arrow that cleaves to its object; in the state of its release the Jīva reposes itself in Hari (Viṣṇu).[34]

Mukti is positive and the supreme bliss is not the mere absence of pain. The Jīva hears and only through Brahman experiences everything" (BSBh.III.3.33). Madhva takes into his system the Sāṁkhya idea of 'Kaivalya' and says in VTV, that Viṣṇu alone is the liberator.[35]

Through the anthropomorphic way, Madhva teaches the theistic view of release of soul's union with the Supreme Being.[36]

4.20.PROBLEM OF EVIL IN MADHVA:

Madhva, through his doctrine of Svarūpatāratamya or Traividyam, accepts the existence of evil and inequality in the world- such as suffering, pain, and sin (pāpa). Though there is the difference among souls, some souls are good and some are basically wicked or evil by their very nature (svarūpa); the wicked souls are incapable of reaching liberation (mukti-ayōgya). This is the only and the ultimate solution for the problem of evil that the Madhvites propose; and according to them, this type of theory is very essential for true theism.[37]

4.21.CRITICISM OF MADHVA THEORY OF THE PROBLEM OF EVIL:

---

34. B.N.K.Sharma, The Bhagavadgīta Bhāṣya of Śrī Madhvācārya, Adhyāya XII, 5, 6, 7, PP.246-252; Kath.Up. Bh. P.19; Cf. also, BSBh.IV.4.4; BSBh.III.3.33.
35. S.S. Rāghavāchār, VTV.No.111, p.27.
36. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.279-280.
37. Tapasyānanda, Śrī Madhvācārya, His life, Religion and Philosophy,(Madras: Śrī Ramakrishna Math),pp.72-73; B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy of Sri Madhvacarya, footnote, e.8, p.294; see also, pp.359-369;Tapasyānanda, Śrī Madhvācārya,-life-Religion-Philosophy,p.73; Tapasyānanda, Bhakti Schools of Vedānta, p.179.

Rarest Archiver

From the above explanations it is clear that some souls by nature are good and others wicked, incapable of reaching mukti. Since actions proceed from the nature of beings it is clear that evil and wickedness flow from the wicked spirits (souls). But the question is, Are not the mukti-ayōgya souls too eternally dependent on Viṣnu? So, can we say that ultimately the svarūpa of beings explain the evil in this world? Moreover, it is a basic belief of Madhvism that God is the principal agent in all beings and induced by Viṣṇu all beings act. Madhva explicitly accepts that at the command of the Lord, Śiva and others composed the durāgamas (bad scriptures) in order to keep the wicked souls in ignorance. If this were the case, is it not God himself the cause of evil? No religious man can easily accept such a position. God is not partial; He is goodness itself. So when faced with the problem of evil Madhva can only shift from karma to svarūpabhēda and then back to karma. Yet at the same time he will have to hold on to the total dependence of all things on God and to God's causality in all the activities of finite beings. Such being the case Madhva seems to be silently accepting the fact that the problem of evil cannot be satisfactorily solved at the level of our thinking.[38]

4.22.OUR CRITICAL APPRECIATION OF MADHVA'S DVAITA:

Madhva's doctrine of Bimbapratibimbabhāva (relation between God and Soul) is a new concept that goes beyond all contemporary attempts to solve the problem of God-man (Jīvas) relationship. Through the concept of Bhēda (difference) Madhva does not opine a sense of pure exclusion between soul and God. The relationship between God and Jiva is not merely external master-and-servant relation (Jayatīrtha, Tayti. p.29) in

---

[38]. Puthiadam, God, p.81.

Rarest Archiver

in the Supreme Lord. Only through the (symbolic) relation of **Bimbapratibimbabhāva** the soul has its relation with God. In **mokṣa**, the soul's consciousness is not extinct but it is placed in sublimation with the Infinite Lord (BSBh.iii.2.19). This concept of Madhva touches mysticism at important points.

Madhva affirms that the Bimbapratibimbabhāva relation between God and Soul is a sacred and inviolable relation. In mokṣa the soul is similar (in some respects) to God. The "Pratibimbatva" is the truest, most beautiful and permanent bond of soul with the Supreme Lord.[39] Madhva's approach to certain philosophical problems such as, Svarūpabhēda-Tāratamya-Traividhya, freedom-free will that exists among Jīvas, is an unique contribution to the concepts of the problem of Evil that is much appreciated. Madhva's doctrine of Traividhya may not promise Sarvamukti to all souls. But in Madhva's clarification, his theory of Jīva-traividhya is logically drawn conclusion and much drived from sacred scriptures. His doctrine goes beyond the commonly accepted explanations of the theory of karma in Vedānta, as the last explanation of the inequalities of life in the world. Madhva's doctrine believes that the theory of Karma, which is supposed to explain the inequities of the world, must in the last analysis take recourse to certain basic differences that exist in the nature (svabhāva) of the souls themselves. The doctrine of karma cannot profusely explain the origin of evil and suffering because it involves an infinite regression as expressed in the terma 'anādi'.[40]

---

[39]. B.N.K. Sharma, Philosophy,PP.45, 46 & 307.
[40]. Sivaswami Ayyar, Kamala Lectures, p.143.

Rarest Archiver

CHAPTER-5

THE WORLD-JAGAT

5.0.GENERAL INTRODUCTION:

In Madhva, the eternal Viṣṇu is the eternal Lord of the eternal realities, viz., the Jīvas (Souls), Prakṛti etc. Viṣṇu's attributes and He as the primary purport of every word (Viṣṇu's Sarvanāmata) should only be understood in relation to this Universe. Madhva starts his realistic metaphysics from Sense-perception (pratyakṣa), Sakṣyānubhava, and inference and interprets the truths of Scripture in accordance with the authority of Sākṣi-pramaṇa and Upajīvya-pramāṇa. Viṣṇu is said to be Svatantra who occupies the central position, with matter and souls keeping their legitimate positions under Him. Madhva expresses this reality in a system of fivefold distinction (pancabhēda) that gives it its philosophical designation of 'Prapanca. The valuable fivefold difference is called 'Prapanca'. In his VTV. Madhva, writes, "That which consists of the great (pra) five kinds of differences (panca) is 'prapanca'.[1]

In his VTV.Madhva writes, "The Parama-śruti says: 'The universe consists of five differences. They are the difference between God and the individual self, that between God and insentient matter, that among individual selves, that between insentient matter and individual self and that among the material entities themselves. This is real and unoriginated.[2]

---

1. S.S.Rāghavāchār, VTV.No.325, p.71.
2. S.S.Rāghavāchār, VTV.No.340, p.73;B.N.K.Sharma, Teachings, p.78).

Rarest Archiver

The eternal relation between the Brahman, Prakṛti and Jīva is the pra-panca - the uniquely five.[3]

5.1.REALITY OF THE WORLD EXPERIENCE:

Madhva Metaphysically brings in the reality of the World and its value under the three valid pramāṇas (means of valid knowledge) viz., Perceptual, Rational, Scriptural knowledge; and the doctrine of Sākṣi. The physical world is presented to perception (pratyakṣa), which is a means of valid knowledge and which operates under the unerring principle of Sākṣin. There is no reason to doubt the veracity of pratyakṣa. There are texts in the Upaniṣads, which describe the evolution of the real world; and by being the object of perceptual knowledge, the world is real.[4]

The reality of the world follows from the doctrine of self-validity of knowledge (AV.iii.2.3). Sense -perception cannot, therefore, be deprived of its validity, *except by a more valid perception* (VTN). If, the reality of the world is denied, then, ethics altogether ceases to have any importance".[5] Thus, it is on this rock of Sākṣipratyakṣa that Madhva has built his edifice of Dvaita-Vedānta.[6]

5.2.VIṢṆU, THE CAUSE OF THE ORIGIN, SUPPORT AND DESTRUCTION OF THE WORLD:

In accordance to the Vedāntic tradtion, Madhva holds that Viṣṇu alone is the cause of the Production (Sṛṣti), Support (Sthithi) and Destruction or Dissolution (Saṁhāra) of this Universe; and the Sacred tradition teaches this truth (AV.I.1.90; BSBh.I.1.2). The very first verse of the AV says:

---

3. Swami Tapasyānanda, Śrī Madhvācārya His Life, Religion & Philosophy, p. 56.
4. T.P. Ramachandran, Op.Cit.,p.96.
5. *Indian Thought and Its Development, p.60*).
6. B.N.K.Sharama, Philosophy, PP.202-207).

Rarest Archiver

'he from whom the origination etc., of the universe' are, is Viṣṇu (AV.I.1.90; AV.I.1.2). From Viṣṇu proceed 'origination or Creation (sṛṣṭi); Sustenance or Support (Sthithi), Dissolution (Saṁhāra); Control or government (niyamana); Obscuration or ignorance (ajñāna); Enlightenment or knowledge (jñāna); Bondage (bandha); and finally Release or liberation (mokṣa) (BSBh.I.1.2). This is the definition of Viṣṇu. According to Madhva, innumerable Vēdic passages reveal this truth.[7] "That, verily, whence beings here are born, that by which when born they live, that into which on deceasing they enter".[8]

5.3.THE MEANING AND NATURE OF CREATION:

There are two orders of causes in Madhva system, namely: 1.Material cause (Upādana Kāraṇa) and 2. The Efficient cause (Nimitta Kāraṇa). The material cause is Prakṛti and Viṣṇu the efficient cause. It is the material cause (Upādana Kāraṇa) that undergoes transformation and acquires (āpti) new Viśeṣas called specifications. The Independent Viṣṇu is the active power who transforms Prakṛti. Therefore the acquiring of new specifications (Viśeṣas) depends on another called Parādhīna who is Viṣṇu. Thus according to Madhva, the origination of the world takes place through the co-operation of these two causes namely Upādana (Prakṛti) and Nimitta.[9]

5.4.THE DOCTRINE OF PARĀDHĪNA -VIŚEṢĀPTI:

In the system of Madhva there are 'eternal' entities called Nityapadarthas or Anādinitya such as, Time, Space,

---

7. BSBh.I.1.2; BS.I.1.2. Rg.V.X.125.1-8;ibid.I.164; Tait.Up. III.1.
8. R.E. Hume, p.290; Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP. 153-154).
9. Dvadaśa stōtra, iv.3; Madhva's commentary on Ch — Up. Vi.1; NS.i.4.p.200; Taitt Up.ii.8; B.N.K. Shrama, Philosophy p.210; Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.167-168; Puthiadam, God, PP.77-78; B.N.K. Shrama, Philosophy,pp.220-221.

Rarest Archiver

Matter and Souls (Jīvas) and Vēdas as well; there are also non-eternal entities called 'Anitya' entities which come into being and undergo change in their nature and also perish. Madhva introduces his new theory of "Eternal Creation" or 'creation of eternal entities through Parādhīna-Viśēṣāpti.[10] According to Madhva there are two types of changes:

5.4.1.SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE (ABHUTVA BHĀVANAM):

The change here is that which transforms the basic nature of a substance. Example: Milk changes into curd. Herein, the complete change is effected in the substance, a total change or to a new and a different one; it is called "Abhutva bhāvanam".

5.4.2.PARĀDHĪNAVIŚĒṢĀPTI:

In this type of change, the substratum and most of its essential features are intact,but certain additional traits come in the process of change; this is called 'Parādhīna-Viśēṣāpti' (it is acquiring a new trait or complexion that depends on 'Other"(God's will). More concretely this means the āpti (acquiring) of a new traits or subsidiary characteristics called Viśēṣas that depend on (the will of) the 'other' (God-Viṣnu) who is Parādhīna.[11]

5.5.VIṢNU IS ONLY THE EFFICIENT CAUSE AND NOT THE MATERIAL CAUSE OF THE WORLD:

We find in Pūrṇaprajñādarśanam, 1.2.23; 1.2.22& Madhvasidhāntasaraḥ, p.44-50, that Brahaman is the efficient cause of the universe and not the material cause. He rules the universe, but does not create it. He is the only independent reality, everything is dependent on Him. The primordial Prakṛti is the material cause of the universe. Prakṛti is also

---

10. B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy, pp.226-227.
11. Ibid.,p.227;Tapasyānanda, Bhakti schools of Vedānta, PP.155-156.

Rarest Archiver

dependent on the Lord and she has two aspects - the unmanifested and the inanimate prakṛti, and the conscious prakṛti. Brahman creates the universe out of non-intelligent prakṛti, which is composed of three guṇas- stva, rajas, and tāmasa. When the Supreme self wills to create, then He disturbs the equilibrium of the Prakṛti and the process of creation begins. There are different stages of creation.[12]

Viṣṇu is unchangeable for He is undivided or He has no parts (BSBh.II.3.7). unchangeable Viṣṇu effects the changeable realities (entities) in the world. Viṣṇu is the power, but He himself has no parts (BSBh.II.iii.9). Viṣṇu is merely the instrumental cause who creates the world from Prakṛti (primordial matter). The gulf between spirit (God) and matter is so great that it is impossible for a spirit to evolve into a material being.[13] Hence the Brahma-pariṇāma-vāda and vivartavāda are rejected.[14-15] Viṣṇu's causality is not like the one (father) who is the cause for his son's body but like the soul of a seed (bījajīva).

5.6.THE THEORY OF SAD-ASAT-KĀRYA -VĀDA IN DVAITA:

The theory of Causality or Creation (sṛṣti) is said to be Sad-Asat-Kārya-Vāda in the Dvaita system of thought. It means that the effect (product) before its existence in some way pre-exists (sat- existent) with respect to its cause and it does not (non-existent) pre-exist (asat) in the cause with respect to its state as effect (product). In other words, it is existent after its existence as an effect (product) and non-existent as the Cause. The Dvaitins by no means affirm that the effect is totally non-existent in the cause (material

---

12. Anita Nag, Six Systems of Vedānta Philosophy,(Calcutta:Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1986),PP.81-83.
13. Puthiadam, God, PP.76-76;B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy,p.173.
14-15 Ch.Up. Bh.VI.8; AV.1.4.71ff).

Rarest Archiver

cause). The effect in some way pre-exists (sat) and does not pre-exist (asat) in the cause.[16]

5.7.THE PURPOSE OF CREATION (SRṢTI):

What was Viṣnu's motivation to create this world or what induced Him to create the same? is a question legitimately raised. First of all Viṣnu engages himself in creating and anhilating this world out of play (līla). This sport of Viṣnu is rooted in the bliss of Viṣnu. He creates this world out of His līla, not for the sake of gaining even a 'particle' of profit or prayōjana (BSBh.II.1.34; BSBh.I.1.14).. Therefore Madhva often says that this universe arises out of the ānanda (bliss) or sukaha of Viṣnu. The free Lord acts because such is His blissful nature and His activity of creation is nothing more than an act of willing-iccha (AV.II.1.108). What Viṣnu intends for the effects is the liberation of the good and the damnation of the wicked.[17]

God creates new worlds not on account of egoistic motives, but on account of love to the souls who can fulfill their mission and reach their goal (salvation, mukti etc) only by taking part in the world process.[18]

5.8.EVOLUTION OF THE WORLD IN MADHVA:

Madhva elaborates the concept of the 'Evolution of the world' through cosmogenic myths and also depends on the Pancarātra view (it teaches that the evolution of the world is from Viṣnu), the Śaṁkhya idea of evolution of the world and Upaniṣadic myths, Epics, Purāṇas, Mahābhārata, the Bhāgavata, Śruti texts and others.[19]

---

16. Puthiadam, Viṣnu the Ever Free, pp.177-180.
17. Ibid.,PP.184-185.
18. Glasennap, Madhva's Philosophy of the Viṣnu Faith, PP.120, 162;Puthiadam, Viṣnu the Ever Free, PP.180-183).
19. Ibid.,p.185-186; B.N.K. Sharma, Philosophy, p.232.

Rarest Archiver

Madhva's reports on creation often deviate strongly from one another and cannot always be really harmonized.[20] According to him the Prakṛti (the primordial material stuff) is indestructible and eternal. The sṛṣti (world- creation), pralaya (dissolution of the world) regularly happens in a constant recurring rotation. Thus as it is written in Bhagavad Gīta, Kṛiṣṇa says to Arjuna, "at the end of the millennium every material manifestation enters into my nature, and at the beginning of another millennium, by My potency I again create".[21]

Thus every world-creation is perpetually followed by the end of the world. There follows after a long respite (interval of rest or cessation) a New World creation. Therefore the events like creation (evolution-sṛṣti) and reabsorption (involution) have taken place countless number of times since times immemorial and which will take place again and again in eternity and that too forever in a manner established once for all (happening countless times eternally).[22] He comments on these texts according to his deep faith in Viṣṇu; and so there is 'Vaiṣṇavaisation' in his system wherein he wants to confirm the absolute supremacy of Viṣṇu.

5.9.VIṢṆU AND THE REALITY OF THE WORLD:

In Madhva, the production of the world is the effect of the 'Creative activity' of Viṣṇu. This world is as real as Viṣṇu (Brahman) Himself. The reality of the world and the reality of Viṣṇu are intimately related to each other. Thus the denial of the reality of the world is a blasphemy against the Absolute cause of all. The material causality of the world

---

20. B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy, p.232.
21. Bh.Gīt.Ch.9.Text.7, PP.454-455.
22. Glassennap, Viṣṇu Faith, p.121.

Rarest Archiver

i.e., Prakṛti (primordial matter) is always subservient to the will (iccha) of Viṣṇu.

5.10.VIṢṆU-DISSOLUTION (REABSORPTION) (PRALAYA) OF THE WORLD:

Madhva's Philosophical concept of 'Viṣṇu and the dissolution (pralaya) of the world' is that just as Viṣṇu is the cause of the origination of the world (or evolution and preservation) and its supportive cause and ruler, so also He is the cause of its dissolution -reabsorption (pralaya). Therefore the Blessed Lord (Kṛṣṇa) said to Arjuna, "Time I am, destroyer of the worlds, and I have come to engage all people".[23] Viṣṇu is the destroyer of all. When something is destroyed it is destroyed by God and the human or other agency is only an instrument of God.[24]

The world's annihilation can be either partial or total. Madhva maintains that when a day of Brahma (dainandinō-pralaya) or a Manu -period (Manu-pralaya) comes to an end then the partial world annihilation occurs regularly. The partial pralaya (reabsorption) extends only to the three worlds such as; Bhu, Bhuva and Svarlōka and not to the gods inhabiting this world. At the "great pralaya" called 'mahāpralaya' there will be a complete reabsorption-dissolution of the world.[25] As Madhva says, we never experience total destruction, i.e., a destruction, which does not leave some residue behind. So we are not entitled to speak of a total absence of reality at the time of dissolution. Thus dissolution of the universe does not mean total annihilation at all.[26]

---

23. Bh.Gīt.Ch.11.Text.32, 33, p.563.
24. K.T. Pandurangi, Essentials of Gītabhāshya and Gītatātparya, p.32;B.N.K. Sharma, Bhagavadgīta Bhāshya, Adhyāya, XI. 32-33, p.235).
25. Glassenap, Philosophy PP.129-130, 165.
26. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever, Free, p.214-215.

Rarest Archiver

5.11.THE AGES OF THE WORLD:

These seem to be the mythological explanations of Madhva for the problem of the 'ages of the world'. Like the prime matter (prakṛti), the time (kāla) is an eternal world principle as a whole.

At the time of world-existence the four world -ages follow one another in regular rotation: Kṛta-Yuga(honesty was very common), the Trēta-Yuga (in which virtue suffered a loss and in which people began to bring sacrifices to attain certain goals); the Dvāpara-Yuga (in which the decay of real belief increased further)and finally the bad Kali-Yuga in which we live now and in which wickedness and Godlessness reaches its climax). The four yugas together, i.e. 4320000 years are called mahāyuga. 1000 mahāyugas make a kalpa and they form one day of Brahma.[27]

5.12.CREATION AND THE USE OF SĀDHANAS(INSTRUMENTS):

The sacred texts prove that Viṣṇu uses various means or sādhanas like prakṛti, space, and time in the work of his world -creation; and He creates human beings according to their past karma. He uses these means to create the universe; and their power to be sādhanas come from Him alone. Madhva, says in his Bhagavad Gīta Bhāshya that Lord makes the use of Prakṛti to create only by way of sport-just as a person strong enough to walk by himself (without support) sometimes carries a stick, while walking".[28] Viṣṇu though takes karma of the souls (jīvas) in to consideration while creating the world, yet karma falls under the sovereign will (iccha) of Viṣṇu.[29]

---

27. Glasennap, Madhva's Philosophy of the Viṣṇu Faith, pp.166, 130-132.
28. B.N.K. Sharma, Bhagavad Gīta Bhāshya of Śrī Madhvācārya, Adhyāya, IX.8, p.195.
29. Nyāya Sudha II.i.37;BSBh.ii.39; AV.II.92;BSBh.ii.94.

Rarest Archiver

PART THREE

COMPARISON AND CONTRAST

Rarest Archiver

COMPARISON AND CONTRAST

INTRODUCTION:

GENERAL OUTLINE OF THE COMPARISON OF PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPTS OF MARTIN BUBER AND SRĪ MADHVĀVCĀRYA:

In the life of man, God and the human Relationships are the significant factors. In the present day situation, the process of secularization, depersonalization, degradation and the objectification of man in the most industrialized and developing countries of the world, both in the West and East is growing very rapidly; and so, one of the custodians of human welfare T.S.Eliot cried out in anguish: "Where is the wisdom, we have lost in knowledge…. The cycle of heaven in twenty centuries brings us further from God and nearer to dust". The proper synthesis between science and religion has failed because of our space age that has produced a lop-sided civilization; and the global holocaust of humanity is the present day matter. There is the spiritual poverty, which is one of the major tragedies of humanity. Real knowledge has become synonymous with the scientific knowledge.[1]

The concept of God and Human Respect (relationship) have very little place in the plans, policies, and calculations of many scientists, economists, futurologists, Psychologists, and politicians. As the History of Philosophy proves, there are great many philosophers in our times both in the West and East who

---

1. G.V.Nadgouda,Sumadhwavijaya of Nārāyan Pandithāchārya, (Poornaprajana Vidyāpeetha,Bangaolre,1991),pp.i-iii.

Rarest Archiver

even speak about the philosophy of the 'death of God' and the 'dehumanization'.

Among all these disturbances there are still a majority of people in the west and east with special reference to India, who believe in the Supremacy of God, religion, spirituality and in a healthy interpersonal human I-Thou relationships. Among those who believed and propagated such concepts were, German-Jewish-Israeli religious philosopher-Theologian Martin Buber of the Twentieth century and the great Dvaita (Vaiṣṇava) Philosopher Śrī Madhvācārya of the medieval period of the Thirteenth century.

In the writings, teachings, activities and lives of these two thinkers, the existence and the Supremacy of God, the reality of the World and Souls (Jīvas), the human person and relationship certainly play a significant part. Both of them always consider God (Eternal Thou- Viṣṇu -Brahman) in relation to man (souls-Jīvas) and the world (Jagat). According to both of them, though God (the Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) is transcendent, yet He is immanent in the animate and inanimate (spiritual and material) beings and in their interpersonal I-Thou relationship in the universe. God pervades the entire universe (material, spiritual-cētana and acētana) through His omnipresence and I-Thou relationship; and the world of beings (animate and inanimate) have to depend on God for their existence -satta, sustenance, destruction and liberation or mukti. God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) is the goal or end of all beings in as much as it is through Him and grace (prasāda) alone that their liberation from this world of pāpa (sin) and dukkha (suffering) is to be achieved. In other words, man attains his salvation or

Rarest Archiver

liberation (mukti) from the world of sin of his bad actions (karma) of dehumanization, depersonalization, degradation of other (I-IT relationship) through the acceptance and unending devotion to his God and in healthy human interpersonal relationship of I-Thou alone.

Though Martin Buber and Śrī Madhvācārya, the two great and prominent representatives of Jews and Vaiṣṇavas (Hindus) of the twentieth and thirteen centuries were not contemporaries, yet both of them as Philosophers, Theologians, and Religious leaders were realists, pluralists, theists, metaphysicians, and staunch believers in God, world, souls and Human Relationship (Respect). The 'Relationship' is a key concept of Buber's Philosophy that starts with the philosophical anthropology and not with metaphysics;[2] and so, Buber becomes the prophet who proclaims that 'the hope for this hour depends upon the renewal of I-Thou relational immediacy.[3]

Whereas, Madhva's philosophy is Sat-siddhānta in which the Supreme Lord Viṣṇu (Nārāyaṇa) is said to be the eightfold dispenser of the universe and abode of infinite auspicious qualities. He is Sarvōttama untouched by blemishes. Jīvōttama, Viṣṇu's Mukhyaprāṇa is His replica that is the greatest among the sentient souls and dependent on Him. The world is real which provides the graded souls (Jīvas) graded and proper facilities to reach their correct destiny. Madhva's Dvaita provides appropriate answers to man, based on valid pramāṇas which activates

---

2. Martin Buber, Knowledge of Man, Trans. Maurice Friedman & Ronald Gregor Smith, (New York: Harper Torch books, 1965), p.60. Hereafter cited as KM.
3. John Macquarrie, Existentialism, An Introduction, Guide and assessment, (Penguin Books, 1973), p. 197.

Rarest Archiver

and takes him in the right direction to work for his own salvation (mukti). Madhva strongly based his doctrine on the eternal Śrutis and Smṛtis, Pancharātra, Purāṇas, Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata that are said to be in tune with the decisive doctrinal principles enunciated by Vēdavyāsa in the Brahmasūtras. Madhva's system is scientific which offers to modern man robust doctrines based on sound authority and correct reasoning; and it motivates him in the right way of life of action and relationship with God and other fellowbeings. Madhva is said to be one of the unrivalled monarchs of renaissance of the reign of Realism and pluralistic Theism in Indian philosophy and religion.[4]

Though both are personalistic philosophers, yet, their understanding of God, World, Man, and his relationship to the above realities, the anthropological concepts, the thought forms and their worldviews differ from each other to some extent. Thus, in Maurice Friedman's opinion, Martin Buber is more of an existential, social, religious and philosophical anthropologist.[5] Buber's approach to philosophy is more human existence-oriented; whereas, Madhva's approach to philosophy is more scriptures or Śruti (Vēdas) oriented. As regards the concept of revelation (Śruti), there is a slight difference between both the thinkers. According to Madhva, the Śruti or the sacred scripture is non personal or authorless (apauruśeya), self valid and eternal (nitya); where as, Buber, following the Jewish traditions held that the Bible (scriptures-revelation) is the old record of the inter human-Divine relationship of I-Thou

---

4. G.V.Nadgouda, Op.Cit., pp.iii-vii.
5. Maurice Friedman, Martin Buber's Life and Work, (Search Press, 1982), p.vii).

Rarest Archiver

experience of Israel with their God Yahweh [6]; and they are written in time and history by the human authors and that too under the inspiration of God.

Under this section of the Part III, sincere attempt is made to analyze, compare and contrast the philosophical thoughts such as, God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu), His relation to man (souls-Jīvas), the world (Jagat) and the I -Thou relationship of the two great twentieth and thirteenth century (medieval) Jewish and Vedānta (Vaiṣṇavism) philosophers Martin Buber and Śrī Madhvācārya.

---

6. Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960) p.54.

Rarest Archiver

CHAPTER I

COMPARISON OF 'THOU' (ETERNAL THOU) AND 'BRHAMAN (VIṢṆU).

1.0. INTRODUCTION:

Martin Buber felt the need of demonstrating the real existence of 'Thou' concept in man, of God and of beings during the 20th century times. Therefore in 1923 there appeared a small volume by Buber entitled 'Ich und Du' (I and Thou) which was described as 'one of the epoch-making books of our generation' and of which Joseph Oldham said, "I question whether any book has been published in the present century, the message of which if it were understood and heeded, would have such far-reaching consequences for the life of our times".

Ronald Gregor Smith, the English translator of 'Ich und Du', retained to use rather the archaic English pronoun 'THOU' because Buber's whole thought seemed to separate anthropological principles of human existence from that of Metaphysics. Though Walter Kaufmanns initially rejected Ronald Gregor Smith's use of 'Thou', yet he himself would seem to acknowledge this fact since he still retains the THOU in the title of his new translations of the work.[1]

1.1. THE CLARIFICATION AND THE MEANING OF 'THOU' (THE OTHER):

In Buber's opinion, in order to come to know the essence of human person ('I') and to define the human existence

---

1. John Macquarrie, Op. Cit., p.157.

Rarest Archives

(Dasein), we must consider man ('I') in his essential relationship to the OTHER (THOUS) beings. Only by a consideration of the essential connection of human person and his relations with all beings, the question of man can be answered.[2] Man can be truly known only if he realizes his possible relationships with his Whole Being with Other beings (thous) in the I-Thou relationship. What is peculiarly characteristic of the human world is above all that something takes place between one being and another the like of which can be found nowhere in nature.[3] Man does not exist in isolation but exists anthropologically in the completeness of the relationship to a 'Thou' person. The I exists only through the relation to the 'Thou' or it is 'man with man'. *Only man with man* provides a full image. Only when we consider man with man or the eternal meeting of the one with the other, we come nearer the answer to the question of man.[4]

Only the man who realizes in his whole life with his whole being, the relations possible to him, helps us to know man truly".[5] The principle of man is a *two-fold movement*, which is man's ability to distance himself from what is over against him and to enter into relationship with it (Thou).[6] The basic fact of anthropology and the most amazing of all earthly facts is that there is in the world a being (I-Thou) who knows the

---

2. Martin Buber, Between Man and Man, Trans. Ronald Gregor Smith, (London & Glasgow: Collins, Fontana Lib., 1961), p.219. Hereafter cited as BMM.
3. Ibid., p. 244.
4. Ibid., pp. 246-47.
5. Ibid., p. 240.
6. Martin Buber, KM, p. 60.

Rarest Archiver

universe as universe, its space as space, its time as time, and knows himself in it as knowing it.[7]

'Man with man' (Thou with Thou) is the only thing that constitutes the authentic human existence, the wholeness of man and the totality of human existence. [8] "Humanity in general is essentially the existence of man in entities of mankind which are bound together in generations and in society.[9] The reality of the total human existence becomes possible only in the confrontation of I with the Thou (other).[10] Man, in his concrete situation of houselesnsess now becomes a problem anew in order to realize himself through the realization of interpersonal relationship, by which he breaks open the fences he has erected around himself and goes out to meet his Thou (Other), in I-Thou relationship.[11]

1.1.1.THE SUMMARY OF 'THOU':

According to Buber, the 'Thou' of the I-Thou is not only limited to men but includes animals, trees, objects of nature and God (Eternal Thou). Concretely, 'Thou' could be understood as the natural capacity to enter into relationship, positive, respect, and divine attitude (soul attitude of goodness) of relationship that is in my 'I'. And through this positive attitude 'I' relate with the other beings (man, beings, God) in I-Thou or I-IT relationship. 'Thou' is that which stands over against the other and the 'personality' and the 'personal'

---

7. Ibid.,p. 190.
8. Ibid., p. 150.
9. Ibid.,p. 196.
10. Ibid., pp. 153-56.
11. Ibid., p. 243.

Rarest Archiver

really exists in it. Thus being true to the being in which and before which I am placed is the one thing that is needful.[12]

Thou is conceived as 'whole' and Thou is not just a thing among other things. He is 'Thou' (other) who fills the heavens. There is quality of presentness that belongs to the Thou. Thou is always in present and Thou's relationship is agape (fellowship). 'Thou' is the presence of the Divine. Man could never hope to find God (Eternal Thou) and to live a genuine existence in the performance of empty and meaningless rituals except through the 'Thou' relationship.[13]

There is a divine spark in every human being and only by living an authentic life and hallowing the world in man, he finds the divine. To each Thou the highest is open, each life has its access to reality, each nature its eternal right, from each thing a way leads to God, and each way that leads to God, who is the way.[14] He who speaks the word God and really has Thou in mind (whatever the illusion by which he is held) addresses the true Thou of his life, which cannot be limited by another Thou, and to which he stands in a relation that gathers up and includes all others.[15]

God is Eternal Thou and only in this Eternal Thou man can sustain indefinitely the I-Thou situation. God is the wholly the Other. He is not only to be observed but also reveals Himself. Failing in 'Thou' relationship with the other 'Thous' man may

---

12. John Macquarrie, Twentieth Century Religious Thought, (SCM Press Ltd., 1963), PP.195-96.
13. Francis J. Lescoe, Existentialism With or Without God, p.140.
14. Martin Buber, KM.p.120; Cf. also, Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.
15. Martin Buber, I and Thou, Trans. Ronald Gregor Smith, (T&T Clark Edinburg, 1994), p.100. Hereafter cited as IT.

Rarest Archiver

fail completely in knowing his God. Each person is the breath, reflection and spark of God.[16]

Life is also an endless transition from the 'Thou' to 'IT' and back to 'Thou'. Time comes sooner or later when even the most cherished 'Thou' recedes when a spiritual tiredness overtakes the most authentic I-Thou relationship and turns it into I-IT. But there is one 'Thou', who by His very nature cannot become an 'IT' (The Eternal Thou).

1.2.THE 'ETERNAL THOU' AND BRAHMAN (VIṢṆU): THE EXISTENCE AND THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD-BIBLE AND ŚRUTI ORIENTED APPROACHES IN BUBER AND MADHVA:

Martin Buber calls his God (Yahweh) of the Old Testament of the Bible as the 'Eternal Thou' whom man meets in the true life of I-Thou relationship. To clarify the concept 'God', Buber uses the term 'Eternal Thou" because in his opinion the Yahweh of the Old Testament of the Bible is also the 'Eternal Thou' who first entered into the lives of Israelites and invited them into I-Thou relationship with Him.[17] The Eternal Thou (Yahweh) speaks with Moses the representative of the people of Israel on mount Horeb as: "I AM WHO I AM".[18] The 'Eternal Thou' is not a substitutive word for the word 'God' which cannot be replaced by any, according to Buber.[19]

On the other hand Madhva's main question was whether Brahman (the Absolute Being- God) is Viṣṇu or Śiva? Madhva strongly maintains that Brahman is the Supreme Viṣṇu and the

---

16. Ibid., p.19.
17. Martin Buber, 'On the Bible. Eighteen Studies, ed. Nahum N. Glatzer, (New York: Schoken Books, 1968) p.118.
18. RSV, BIBLE, Exodus, 3:14, p.50.
19. Buber, IT, p.100.

Rarest Archiver

name of Viṣṇu cannot be replaced by any other name; and the Śruti texts (Scriptures) speak and mention only of Viṣṇu. Therefore in his VTV, he says, "I offer adoration always to Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu), who is cognizable in all his uniqueness only through the right scriptures...".[20]

1.3.THE CONCEPT OF GOD-SIMILARITIES OF APPROACH IN BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber and Madhva's many views on the subject matter of the knowledge of the Eternal Thou-Brahman (Viṣṇu) seem to complement and supplement each other to some extent. Buber had the faith and belief in the Yahweh of the Old Testament and was trained in the Torah (first five books of the Old Testament- Mosaic Law). He believes in the Bible, wherein the Eternal Thou-God (Yahweh) addresses individual and the community to sanctify itself in the community of persons. He revolutionized the contemporary Jewish and Christian religious philosophy with his I-Thou interpersonal relationship that is an important view of human and divine existence.[21]

Martin Buber's inquiry into the knowledge and existence of Eternal Thou is 'Existence - relationship and Bible oriented. In his work, 'The Prophetic Faith', Buber sees the Bible as the old record of the I-Thou relationship and experience of Israel with their God Yahweh. This relational experience of Israel is said to be the witness of a thousand year old I-Thou relation 'between the I of the speaking God and the Thou of the hearing Israel.[22] Therefore the very foundation of Biblical faith for

---

20. S.S.Rāghavācār, VTV.No.1, (Śri Ramakrishna Ashrama, Mangalore, 1959), p.1.
21. Maurice Friedmann, Op.Cit., pref.vii.
22. Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith, p.54.

Rarest Archiver

Buber is the I-Thou relationship, which is the underlying reality of human existence and the interhuman-divine relation between God and man; and that is the essence of Biblical religion. For Buber, one constant theme that runs though all the books of the Bible is the encounter between a group of people (Israel) and the Lord of the world-The Eternal Thou, in the course of human history. The meaning of history in the Bible is a relation between the people of Israel (the chosen people representing the whole of humanity) and the Eternal Thou-God. According to Buber, the Bible describes the various stages of this I-Thou relation between God and His people. He says, 'the basic teaching that fills the Hebrew Bible is, that our life is a I-Thou relationship between the above and below, between heaven and earth.[23] The character of the Ten Commandments of the Bible is also God-man I-Thou relationship and these are spoken by the I (The Eternal Thou) to a Thou (man). Every one of the commandments begin with an I and are addressed to a personal Thou.[24] The heart or the soul of the Decalogue (The Ten Commandments, given to Moses by God at Mount Sinai-Exodus.20), is the divine-human relationship. Even in the New Testament of the Bible, Jesus accepted them as the basis of his teaching and promised them to carry to completion. He says, "Not one dot, not one little stroke, shall disappear from the Law until its purpose is achieved"(Mathew, 5:18). Etym.Greek, *deka, ten+logos,*

---

23. Martin Buber, 'On Judaism', ed. Nahum N. Glatzer, (New York: Schocken Books, 1968), PP.214-215.
24. Martin Buber, on the Bible, p.118.

Rarest Archiver

a speech, saying: *dekalogos*, the Ten Commandments)[25], is the word 'Thou' (God-man). Man encounters the Eternal Thou of the Bible only in community of persons and not outside of it.[26] God takes initiative in inviting the Israelites (community of humanity) to enter into personal relationship with Him. And in the act of inviting men into encounter, God Himself is known as a person and the person par excellence. God cannot be sought because He has no place. To know God as person is the religious and relational language. He should only be encountered in the I-Thou relationship. Thus, "Whoever goes forth to his Thou with his whole being, and carries to it all the being of the world, finds Him whom one cannot seek.[27]

Madhva also was more of a Śruti- Scripture-centered philosopher. He believed that the finite (animate and inanimate beings) and the infinite (Brahmam, Viṣṇu) realities can be bridged by the knowledge of the Vēdas (Śruti-Vēdas) alone. His strong contention is that, if we are able to attain the knowledge of Viṣṇu through the rational arguments especially of 'causality etc' then the scripture-Vēdas- śruti become useless and the transcendence of Viṣṇu will be affected; and Viṣṇu becomes finite and comprehensible like any of the object. Viṣṇu alone is Supreme God (Brahman) and the eternal and impersonal Scriptures or Vēdas (Śruti) alone can give the full knowledge of

---

25. John A.Hardon, S.J. Pocket Catholic Dictionary, (New York:IMAGE BOOKS, 1985), p.104

26. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., p.355.

27. Martin Buber, IT, p.1-4.

Rarest Archiver

Him. And in his BSBh, Madhva says, "Viṣṇu can only be known through the sacred texts".[28]

Viṣṇu (God) is not a possibility because Vēdas have told us about the Good -God -Viṣṇu who exists. Thus in his N.S Jayatīrtha mentions that because the Vēdas tell us that God exists, the existence of Him is not a pure hypothesis and He really exists as a reality.[29] Though some sacred texts declare that Brahman is unmanifest and unspeakable, these Vēdic statements do not mean to say that Brahman is utterly unknowable but they only state that the *Supreme Brahman is not fully known* or fully comprehended by man. This can be explained through an example as the wise men though see the golden mount Meru, yet they do not see it completely or fully. In the same manner Brahman cannot be fully seen or described, reasoned out or known.[30]

The Śruti (revelation) can establish Viṣṇu's real nature and attributes. Once we know Viṣṇu through the scriptures (Śruti), then we can also know Him through other means of knowledge like Pratyakṣa (perception) and inference (anumāna).

As for Martin Buber, the Eternal Thou (Yahweh of the Old Testament) was the preamble of faith in his I-Thou relationship, so also for Madhva the existence of Brahman (Viṣṇu) was the preamble of his Vaiṣṇava faith. Martin Buber as a Jew brought up in the Jewish religious tradition took it for granted that the Eternal Thou (Yahweh of the Old Testament) existed, so

---

28. Puthiadam, God in the Thought of St.Thomas Aquinas and Śrī Madhvācārya, (University of Madras, 1978), p.21; B.S.Bh.I.i.3.

29. Nyāya-Sudha-Text quoted by Mle. Siauve.La Doctrine de Madhva, p.79; Cf. also, Puthiadam, 'God'. p.25.

30. BSBS.I.i.5; Puthiadam, 'God', p.22.

Rarest Archiver

likewise Madhva as a staunch Vaiṣṇavite relying on the Sacred texts took the existence of Brahman (Viṣṇu) for granted. But unlike Madhva, Martin Buber substantiates his Eternal Thou with the concept of I-Thou relationship.

For the knowledge of Viṣṇu, Madhva always relied on good scriptures called sadāgamas and substantiated his concept of the existence of Brahman by quoting from the śruti texts. Buber does not quote always from the Bible to substantiate his concept of God but he brings in the same at the level of God-man relationship. But however we can say that for both Buber and Madhva the scripture is the ultimate criterion or ground to prove the supra-sensible knowledge like the Eternal Thou (of Buber) and Viṣṇu (of Madhva). The criterion of Scripture (revelation) to know the existence of God is implicitly important to Martin Buber and explicitly important to Madhva. Buber and Madhva had believed in their God before they came to philosophize on the doctrine of the existence of God. Thus it may be little difficult to call them philosophers as regards their philosophy of God is concerned, because their doctrine of Eternal Thou and Brahman is not the out come of pure philosophical analysis. Therefore Charles Hartshorne had said that 'Buber has no metaphysics'. Though Buber uses the language of the disciplines of philosophy and theology, according to his critics, he was not an academic philosopher or a professional theologian.

Rāghavēndrācār says, "The mere interpretation of the Vēda cannot be philosophy. But an exposition of the philosophical implication of the Vēdic teaching is philosophy. These words of Rāghavēndrācār can also be applied to Madhva. Madhva is also a

Rarest Archiver

philosopher in the sense that though he holds the authority of the Vēdas in his system of philosophy, his doctrinal expositions expose the philosophical implications of the Scriptures (śāstrās -Vēdas). Therefore, only the interpretations of Śāstras (Scriptures) and Upaniṣads or their expositions cannot be termed as philosophy but their philosophical expositions truly can be called as philosophy.[31] In this sense too, as Buber himself acknowledges of his non-specific and sustained systematic philosophy, his main concern is directed towards the encounter of man with man and man with Eternal Thou and world through the Biblical (revelation) faith of the people of Israel. As his concern is not to elaborate a philosophical system or to pose some solutions to the epistemological or ethical problems but to carry out a conversation with the reality of beings-man-God-world that went unnoticed. Thus, in this sense, Buber philosophically analyzed and substantiated his belief in the existence of the Eternal Thou through the Biblical faith.

The philosophies of both these thinkers are not a speculative philosophy. While there are many theistic and theological elements of the scriptures (śāstrās) that are found in Madhva, the anthropocentric I-Thou relational elements are prevalent in the existential system of Buber. The terminology for the existence of God as 'Eternal Thou' was the new invention of Buber, whereas the terminology 'Viṣṇu' was not the new invention of Madhva, for, he inherited it from the Vaiṣṇavism. The concept of the Scriptures like Bible and Śruti (Śāstarās) were not new to Buber and Madhva but they merely interpreted

---

31. H.N.Rāghavendrachār ————, The Dvaita Philosophy and Its Place in the Vedānta, (University of Mysore, 1941), PP.14-15.

Rarest Archiver

them according to their own religious, theological and philosophical backgrounds to prove the existence of God. Hence we can rightly say that the very essence of the doctrines of Buber and Madhva came from the Scriptures (śāstrās) as the divine revelation. Bible was the ground for Buber and Śruti (vēdas) was for Madhva to prove the existence of God. In no way Buber contradicted or went against the Bible and the decalogue but he only gave a new interpretation and fresh out look to them through the terminology of Eternal Thou and His I-Thou relationship to man and world.

For Madhva, the Śruti (scripture-śāstrās) were supreme and through the same alone he tried to establish the origin of Viṣṇu as the highest God in his Dvaita system. It is through the genuine and correct interpretation that he proved the Supremacy of Viṣṇu.[32]

Thus for Madhva, though Viṣṇu cannot be fully known or comprehended, He is an object of our knowledge; and He is known through the Vēdas and the Vēdic testimony.

1.4.FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD THE RATIONAL PROOFS ARE NOT END OR CONCLUSIVE IN BUBER AND MADHVA:

In Buber's affirmation, the address of the Eternal Thou to man primarily is revelation-scripture. The revelation tells us only as God is and not what His essence is. It is through personal revelation that the Eternal Thou manifests Himself to humanity. In revelation we may not come to know the knowledge about this Eternal Thou or no sure statement about Him (Absolute

---

[32]. Helmuth Glasenapp, Madhva's Philosophy of Viṣṇu Faith, ed. K.T. Pandurangi, (Dvaita Vedānta Studies and Research Foundation, Bangalore, 19920, PP.22-23; Cf. also, C.M.Padmanabhācārya, The Life and Teachings of Śrī Madhvācārya (Uḍipi, S.K), PP.42-46.

Rarest Archiver

Being) is drawn, yet it only manifests the certainty of the presence of the hidden God and the meeting of man with the Eternal Thou. *The revelation does not give content* or the formulated reality of the Absolute; but it gives only a *presence* of the God that IS. Buber interprets the Biblical text, Ex. 3:14, of God "*I AM WHO I AM*" as, " *I SHALL BE THERE AS THERE I SHALL BE*".[33]

Therefore, Biblical words mean '*happening, coming into being, being there, being present only and* in the abstract sense of the terms. The word of revelation is '*I AM WHO I AM*'- that ***which reveals is that which reveals.***[34] The revelation (scripture) is concerned with the life of man and not with the mystery of The Eternal Thou.

As is already mentioned above, Buber opines that whatever else God may be, He is one who enters into direct relationship with us men though creative, revelatory and redemptive acts and thus makes it possible for us to enter into a direct relationship to Him.[35]

The God of the Biblical faith and of religious experience cannot be described or defined and He cannot be inferred from anything at all. One need not go to the beginning of history or the nature around to find God. God cannot be deduced from anything. He confronts man immediately where He can be properly addressed in I-Thou; and not expressed. According to Buber, that a "He" spoken of God is a metaphor and a 'Thou' spoken of God is not a metaphor. Here it means that to talk about God outside the actual I-Thou relationship of man to Him is a myth or fiction.

---

33. Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith, p.28.
34. Martin Buber, IT, PP.142-144.
35. Ibid., IT, p.168.

Rarest Archiver

When we speak of God we are prone to turn Him into a being besides other existing beings and as a thing among other things of existence. When we speak to Him is to address Him and responding to his address in reciprocal relationship.[36]

It is clear that all rational systems discovered by man end up in some or other forms of absurdity or paradoxes. Thus reason alone cannot solve all the problems and questions of human beings. Everything cannot be based on rational evidences. The essential aspect of human life is the insecurity or 'the narrow ridge'.

Madhva strongly holds that the reason and sense perception of man alone cannot give us the end (conclusive) knowledge of Viṣṇu (Brahman). Of all the means of knowledge (pramāṇas) anumāna (inference) is the weakest means of knowledge (as also Buber understands) because it either depends on pratyakṣa (perception) to support as the basis of its vyāpti or on the testimony of Vēdas because according to the right rules it is used to interpret the Vēdas. Hence, the existence of Brahman cannot be proved by the unaided human reason and "His existence cannot be proved by inference, because the opposite also can be proved by inference".[37] The reason and sense perception of man alone can not give us the end (conclusive) knowledge of Viṣṇu (Brahman), where as the Sadāgamas (scriptures-Vēdas) only can give us the real knowledge of Brahman (Viṣṇu). Viṣṇu (God) is not a possibility because Vēdas have told us about the Good -God

---

36. Martin Buber, Replies to My Critics, The Philosophy of Martin Buber, ed. P.Schilpp& M.Friedman (Lib.Living Philosophers, La Sall: Open Court, 1967), p.713.
37. S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV.No.62, p.14.

Rarest Archiver

-Viṣṇu who exists. In his N.S Jayatīrtha mentions that because the Vēdas tell us that God exists, the existence of Him is not a pure hypothesis and He really exists as a reality. Hence, God's existence cannot be proved by the unaided human reason. [38]

The inference in its presentation of the knowledge of Supreme Viṣṇu can surpass its limits and thus reasoning can only help us to attain a human cause; and in the suprasensible (Supreme Lord) realm, the inference that is not assisted by Śruti (Scripture) has no validity.

Martin Buber was well aware that the human intellect (reasoning) is also inadequate to fully grasp the reality of the Eternal Thou who is incomprehensible, unlimited and transcendent. Though the Eternal Thou of the Biblical Faith and of religious experience cannot be described or defined fully and He cannot be inferred from anything at all, the ultimate, perfect and the direct of the Eternal Thou is only possible through the Scriptural and I-Thou relationship.

1.5.ONLY SCRIPTURES (REVELATION) GIVE US THE SUPRASENSIBLE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD-BUBER AND MADHVA:

We can say in the final analysis that both Buber and Madhva hold and agree that the revelation (scriptures- śāstrās-Bible) is very essential for the ultimate knowledge of the Eternal Thou and Brahman (Viṣṇu). No doubt for Madhva the Scripture (āgama) is the primary means (pramāṇas) towards the knowledge of the Absolute Brahman (Viṣṇu). Therefore he explicitly mentions that one who has not studied the Vēdas (āgamas- Śrutis) or understood them, he cannot know the Supreme God (Viṣṇu). But however Buber

---

[38] . Ibid., VTV.No.62, p.14.

Rarest Archiver

is not very rigorous like Madhva to advocate that it is thorough Scripture (revelation) alone we come to know the nature and the existence of the Eternal Thou. As we have already seen, according to him, in revelation (Scripture) we may not come to know the knowledge about God or no sure statement about the Absolute God; but it (revelation) only manifests the certainty of the presence of the hidden God and the meeting of man with the Eternal Thou. The revelation does not give content or the formulated reality of the Absolute; but it gives only a presence of the Being (God) that IS. We have the knowledge of Eternal Thou, only in and through the I-Thou relationship (man with man, man with nature, man with spiritual beings). Thus it is the I-Thou relationship that gives the content of the Eternal Thou and man receives and what he receives is not content but a presence (the presence of the Eternal Thou in I-Thou relationship) as power. Content would destroy the multiplicity of the relationship between God and man. God does not communicate something but Himself only. God as person comes to us speaks to us and discloses Himself to us. Therefore revelation for Buber is not a communication of something or the unveiling of the essence of God; and God's revelation does not have Himself as an object.[39]

In Madhva's strong opinion too, the Supreme Viṣṇu (God) could solely be known through the Vēdas (scriptures-Śāstarās-Śruti). Buber strongly maintained that all the Books of the Bible and the Ten Commandments give the knowledge of God and call man to the I-Thou relationship with Him.[40]

---

39. Martin Buber, IT, PP.139, 142; Martin Buber, BMM, p.73.
40. Martin Buber, On the Bible, p.118.

Rarest Archiver

Buber strongly maintains that the revealed dogma (revelation or Bible) cannot err as regards the truth of the Eternal Thou but the inference can. Thus inference or reason is subordinated to Scripture (Revelation or Bible) in Buber's system of I-Thou relationship. Similarly for Madhva, the sacred scriptures alone reveal the transcendental truths or supra-sensible realities and the knowledge of Brahman (Viṣṇu). Thus he says, "Viṣṇu cannot be apprehended by mere reasoning or by sensuous perception and not by one devoid of the qualifications specified. He can be apprehended and known only through the right scriptures and there is no other way.[41] The perception (pratyakṣa-jñāna) arises because of the contact of the senses with other objects. But the perception (pratyakṣa) though it has an unquestioned authority only within the realm of the perceptual world, it cannot reach the Absolute Being that stands beyond the sphere of perceptual (sensible) world and out side the domain of the individual self. The two great commentators, Trivikrama and Jayatīrtha held that the sense perception unaided by revelation (scriptures) cannot attain Viṣṇu. Further Madhva would maintain that though the sacred texts touch upon the matters of perceptual experience in the realm and sphere of the sensible world, the Śruti (sacred text) should be interpreted in accordance with the experience of the sensible world also.[42] Buber too seems to accept the same concept of Madhva that as long as the I-Thou relational and sense-perceptual knowledge fall in to the realm of the supra-sensible knowledge (Eternal Thou), it has validity.

---

41. S.S.Rāghavāchār, VTV.No.3, p.2.

42. Puthiadam, 'God', PP.22-23.

Rarest Archiver

1.6.THE SCRIPTURES (BIBLE, ŚRUTI) ARE ABOVE REASON AND THEY ARE NON-CONTRARY TO EACH OTHER--BUBER AND MADHVA:

As regards the knowledge of the Eternal Thou and Brahman (Viṣṇu) is concerned, in Buber (implicitly) and Madhva (explicitly), the Scriptures (Bible, Śruti) are above human reason but the Scriptures and reason do not contradict each other.

Buber maintains that though faith and revelation both are necessary, faith and reason must together aspire to find the true goal of wisdom and blessedness of creatures in this world. And hence in this way his philosophy becomes the existential philosophy. Though for Buber, the I-Thou relationship between the Eternal Thou and man is the primary reality and the closely associated relationship of man to God and to his fellowmen is the main concern, yet, he sees all these in the background of the Bible basing on experiential human reason. Though the reality of the Eternal Thou is beyond the human reason yet it is not contrary to human reason. Our faith of the I-Thou relation in the Scripture does not destroy our human rationality of the divine knowledge but it perfects and develops it. Though the revealed truths of the Eternal Thou as revealed through the revelation (Scripture) are beyond human reason, yet, their intelligibility, plausibility and reasonableness can be made clear through human reasoning. While Sartre holds that mankind "must take courage, it must give up once and for all the search for God, it must forget God,", Buber counters by asserting that the only way in which man can find a meaningful and authentic existence is against the background of the Eternal Thou of God, who alone gives purpose and rationality to life. Therefore

Rarest Archiver

according to Buber, human reason is also becomes instrumental in understanding the nature and knowledge of the Eternal **Thou**. At this juncture Buber becomes a philosophical theologian.

Madhva asserts that though anumāna (reason) alone cannot give the full knowledge of God (Viṣṇu) and other revealed truths, yet, these revealed truths of God and other realities are not contrary to reason. The human reason (anumāna) on the other hand helps man to interpret and understand these revealed truths of God (Viṣṇu) given by Scriptures (Śruti), and thereby he is lead to his salvation (mukti). As human reason is at the service of the Scriptures (Revelation-Bible) in Buber's understanding, so also anumāna (reason) is at the service of the Scriptures (Revelation-Śruti-Śāstrās) in Madhva.

1.7.SCRIPTURE (BIBLE-REVELATION-ĀGAMA) AND REASON (RATIONALITY-ANUMĀNA) COMPLEMENT EACH OTHER--BUBER AND MADHVA:

As we have already seen, though reason seems to be subsidiary to Scripture (revelation), yet, it is complementary to Scripture (revelation) and revelation (scripture) to reason in the systems and writings of Buber and Madhva.

In his Nyāya Sudha, Jayatīrtha explains Madhva's understanding that the revelation (āgama) is consistent with perception (pratyakṣa) and reason (anumāna). Here it means that the revelation (āgama) presents the truths that the perception (pratyakṣa) and reason (anumāna) fail to present in the ordinary sense. The revelation makes the reason full and rich because the reason supported by the revelation surely and certainly establishes God (Viṣṇu) (N.S.2, 1.4). Once we come to know God through Śruti (revelation), and when reasoning (anumāna) is

Rarest Archiver

supported by the sacred texts, then such a reasoning can be valid with regard to God. From Sruti we know that God is the cause, the sustainer and destroyer of the world. At this stage it is possible for us to apply the principle of causality and other categories to the realm of God and God-world relationship. In our ordinary reasoning, validity is derived from the observed invariable connection between the probans and the probandum. But in reasoning aided by Śruti, the validity ultimately comes from Śruti itself. So in the last analysis it is Śruti that tells us that the world is an effect and Viṣṇu is the cause of all.[43]

Therefore it is very clear in Madhva that in our effort to know God (Viṣṇu as the Absolute Being) anumāna (reasoning) is not totally rejected or discarded as a useless thing but it (reason) plays a subservient and subordinated role; and once we come to know God (Viṣṇu) through Śruti (revelation), anumāna (reason) can help us to realize very clearly that the basis and ground of the universe is Viṣṇu (God). And at this stage it is possible for us to apply the causality principle and various other categories to the sphere or realm of the Absolute Being (God-Viṣṇu) and God-world relationship. These types of rational demonstrations are able to show that the knowledge of the Absolute Being (God) that we have from revelation (śruti) is not at all false ones. The Absolute Being (Brahman) can be brought forward and conceived as Saguṇa Brahman through anumāna (reason). There is yet another very significant factor in the Dvaita Vedānta of the application of anumāna (reason) on the identity texts called the Paramātman-Jīvātman identity in the so-called concept of-Tatvamasi. Here Madhva interprets the

---

43. Ibid., God, p.27.

Rarest Archiver

identity texts (Śruti) through applying the reason that they are being consistent with the perceptional experience (pratyakṣa anubhava) to show that Brahamn and Jīva (soul) are not identical. Madhva interprets the Scripture (Śruti) here only through reason in accordance with the perceptional experience (pratyakṣa anubhava).

According to Buber, though faith and revelation both are necessary, faith (in God) and reason must together aspire to find the true goal of wisdom and blessedness of creatures in this world. Though we may not find explicit rational (reason oriented) evidences to all his conclusions and statements in his system, it is not correct to say that Buber minimizes reason in his philosophy. He only rejects that all human knowledge and belief should be based on rational criteria that which belong to the world of I-IT and also he regards reason as only a part of the whole man. The reasoned reason substantiates our faith in the incomprehensible Eternal Thou. Thus the Biblical faith does not reject to take reason into consideration. As regards the instruction of the Biblical faith and of the knowledge of God, the reason (rational knowledge) is very much essential and necessary. In the understanding of I-Thou relationship between God, man, world, the reason is an important factor and it can remove certain errors on the road to divine relationship with humanity and world.

1.8.PROOFS (RATIONAL) FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD (ETERNAL THOU- VIṢNU)--BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber's God is behind every Thou whom we meet in the world. Through everything that becomes present to us, we look toward the train of the Eternal Thou and in every true meeting. In

Rarest Archiver

every genuine relational event we can perceive a breath of the Eternal Thou and in each sphere of life, we are able to address the Eternal Thou differently in each Thou. The real God is the God who can be addressed because He is the God who addresses.[44]

It is only in our existence as persons, in our encounter with the finite Thous, we meet the Eternal Thou and we do not know anything of Him outside of this. In contrast to Kierkegaard, there is no such a thing as an I-Thou relationship with God who comes when man turns away from one's fellowmen and the world.[45] The proof for God's existence is that He is the one who enters into a direct relation with us men in creative, revealing and redeeming acts, and thus makes it possible for us to enter into a direct relation with Him.[46] Thus, the proofs for the existence of God are, Existential, Relational, Creative, Redemptive and Biblical.

In line to Madhva's writings, Jayatīrtha says, in one place in his VTV.Tīka, p.2: 'Viṣṇu, though known only in a general way by means of perception and reasoning, is known well only through the sacred texts.[47]

Thus we understand here that though Jayatīrtha maintains that it is through the Śruti as the ultimate criterion, we come to the knowledge of the Supreme Being (God), perception and reasoning can also become as the pointers and hypothesis to the knowledge of Him. Though many of the initial reasonings of

---

44. Martin Buber, The Origin and Meaning of Hassidism, ed.&Trans.M.Friedman (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960), PP.91-92.

45. Maurice Friedmann, Op.Cit., p.355.
46. Martin Buber, IT, p.168.
47. Puthiadam, God, p.24.

Rarest Archiver

Madhva were undeveloped and ordered towards the proof of the existence of God, yet, we find that he strongly proved the existence of God through scriptural basis.

1.9.THE EXISTENCE OF GOD THROUGH THE COSMOLOGICAL ARGUMENT (OR GOD AS THE FIRST CAUSE OF THE WORLD)- BUBER AND MADHVA:

Madhva and his followers interpreted this universe with the theistic interpretation and claimed the validity for their argument from the cosmological argument or the first cause argument. The interpretation of Madhva on the sūtra called 'Janmadyāsya yataḥ' and many other commentaries about this claim, that Brahman (God) is the efficient cause or in other words the instrumental cause (nimitta-kāraṇa) of this world's creation (Origin) sustenance (support) and destruction (pralaya). The order in the universe can be explained only because of the existence of the Supreme Being (God) in it. Madhva often quotes from Bhāgavata Purāṇa, that prakṛti, substance, karma, time, the essential nature of being and Jīva, all exist by Viṣṇu's favour and in His absence they do not exist. The real origin of the universe means sṛṣti of everything as a result of the evolution of prakṛti, and of the union of souls with the bodies. All these happen because of Viṣṇu.[48]

The real origin of universe (sṛṣti) happens because there is the first cause Supreme Viṣṇu. It is the desire of Viṣṇu that induces or disturbs (stirs) the prakṛti (primordial matter) that is in perfect balance and sets in motion the gradual process of creation; and consequence of it, the whole world evolves out of this primordial matter (prakṛti). The free Lord acts because of his blissful nature and His creative act is nothing more than an

---

[48]. Ibid., p.77.

Rarest Archiver

act of His will (AV.II.i.108). Viṣṇu alone is the reason for the ordered creation.[49] The Supreme Brahman (Viṣṇu) being Svatantra (independent) Himself does not move but moves the primordial matter (prakṛti) in creation and all other Jīvas. The eternal entities or realities like Jīvas and prakṛti for their satta (quality) are eternally dependent on Viṣṇu. Thus we cannot explain this world without the Supreme Viṣṇu.[50]

The cosmological argument of Madhva is implicitly similar to Buber's argument where he holds that although we on earth never behold God without world but only the world in God (as the cause of the origination of the world), by beholding we eternally form God's form. If you explore the life of things and of conditioned (ordered) being you come to the unfathomable, if you deny the life of things and of conditioned being you stand before nothingness, if you hallow this life you meet the living God.[51]

Buber strongly claims that the Eternal Thou (God) is *the ground of all* I-Thou and *He is behind every Thou (of everything)* whom we meet in the world, Through everything that becomes present to us, we look toward the train of the Eternal Thou, in each sphere of life there is the Eternal Thou and He is the *underlying principle of everything* who makes them possible, gathering up and fulfilling them all. *The Eternal Thou is the creator, revealer and redeemer of men and creation.*

---

49. Ibid., p.79.

50. K. Narain, An Outline of Madhva's Philosophy, (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1986), p.122.

51. Maurice Friedman, Op. Cit., PP.354-355.

Rarest Archiver

He is the *ground and meaning of our existence that constitutes mutuality arising again and again.*[52]

Madhva brings into his system the concept or principle of causality and order in the world, only to show that the unconscious Jīvas (souls) could not have produced this world because they are dependent (asvātantra) on God and are limited. The contingent (accidental) beings like Jīvas and other realities could never be the cause of this world, but the only necessary being who is the producer of this world is to be the Supreme Brahman (Viṣṇu) Himself. The seed, the pulse, the process of manuring, the dissolution of the body into its elements after death" (BSBh, I, 1, 3) is the Viṣṇu. The spiritual beings exist and the matter cannot be the cause of the world.

1.10.DEGREES OF PERFECTION IN THE ETERNAL THOU AND BRAHMAN (VIṢṆU)—BUBER AND MADHVA:

We find the traces of the argument of the degrees of perfection in the writings of Madhva, and according to him, the reason can go thus far to tell us that in our minds the idea of God is formed. Our mind has the capacity to conceive or understand of the ascending order of power, which may have knowledge, goodness, and beauty in it and this shows that there is in it the idea of perfection. God is the being in which the idea of the highest perfection is realized.[53] Among the Jīvas there is also the concept of the degree of perfection i.e., the

---

52. Martin Buber, IT, p.168.

53. B.N.K.Sharma, Madhva's Teaching in his own words, (Bombay: Bhāratiya Vidyā Bhavan, 1979), PP.111-112.

Rarest Archiver

doctrine of the Svarūpa-bhēda (difference of nature) and Svarūpa-tāratamya (difference of degrees). The Supreme Brahman (Viṣṇu) is the perfection Himself and each Jīva is said to be the pratibimba (reflection) of the reflected (Bimba) that is Viṣṇu, because each Jīva contains in itself a small quantity (modicum) of satyam (Truth), Jñānam (Consciousness) and Ānanda (Bliss) that are essential features of Viṣṇu; and each in its own gradation shares in the perfection of Him.

Buber uses the terms like 'reflection', 'glimpse', 'spark' to souls (Thous) and maintains that every particular Thou (soul) is a glimpse through to the Eternal Thou (God); and by means of every particular Thou the primary word (I-Thou) addresses the Eternal Thou".[54] The Eternal Thou is perfection Himself, and by His very nature He cannot become IT.[55]

1.11.TELEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT OR THE ORDER IN THE UNIVERSE BECAUSE OF THE ETERNAL THOU-VIṢṆU ACC.TO.BUBER AND MADHVA:

According to Madhva, Viṣṇu is the cause of creation, sustenance and destruction of this world and it is He who controlls it. There is the inscrutable power (or a deus ex machina) behind the inviolable laws of nature in the world which unerringly controls all that is in time and space; and the absence of such inscrutable power (God), the complexity of this arrangement of the world order would be impossible. God is the omniscient principle (God) who controls and leads the complex working of the laws of nature in the world. Without the will of Viṣṇu not even a leaf can move. In this extended line,

---

54. Martin Buber, IT, p.99.
55. Ibid.,IT, p.99.

Rarest Archiver

it is said, 'due to this (God's) fear, the Indra, the Vāyu and the Death does run'.[56]

In Buber's conception too, the Eternal Thou is *par excellence* and the world has its deepest roots in Him. There is the order in the world and behind this world order there is the unfathomable Eternal Thou. Through this and behind this conditioned or ordered world we find the living God (Eternal Thou). The 'wholly Other' (God) of Karl Barth, 'Mysterium Tremendum' (God) of Rudolf Otto, is behind this world and the potential (God) is still actual being in the world. The Eternal Thou is the one who is the Creator of this world and has put into this the order and regulation. He is the ground and meaning of our (World's) existence.[57]

1.12.PROOF FOR GOD'S EXISTENCE THROUGH THE MORAL LAW ARGUMENT--BUBER AND MADHVA:

In the writings of Madhva and Buber we find the traces of the moral arguments to prove the existence of God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu). Madhva would hold that God (Viṣṇu) is the cause and reason to control everything or He is the Niyamana of everything. This argument that God is the controller of natural order and of everything should be understood regarding the moral law too. God is the controller of the moral law, which makes certain of the supreme authority under which we are secure. God exists as the moral lawgiver and through this concept the ethical values have certainty. Thus it is clear that from the

---

56. Kathōpaniṣad Mantra, 2, 3.

57. Martin Buber, IT, p.168.

Rarest Archiver

existence of the moral law there is the lawgiver who is God.[58]

Buber too strongly held that God as the Eternal Thou is the moral lawgiver and we find in the I-Thou relational concept. The ethical values have certainty because of the law of I-Thou relationship. God as the moral law giver, enters into a direct relation with us men (world order) in creative, revealing and redeeming acts; therefore, 'the love of God and the love of one's (I-Thou) neighbour is interconnected.[59] The Eternal Thou, as the moral lawgiver enters into relationship as the Absolute Person whom we call God'.[60] The modern Kantian and the Neo-positivist critics may not agree to accept the arguments and proofs proposed by Buber and Madhva regarding the existence of God, because the latters' positions seem to be fideistic and traditionalistic.

1.13.OUR KNOWLEDGE OF GOD (ETERNAL THOU-VIṢṆU)--BUBER AND MADHVA:

The concept of God in Buber is more of an existential, anthropological and I-Thou relational with the mixture of religious and theological explanations; Madhva also understands God (Viṣṇu) more in such concepts. According to both of them, God (Eternal Thou- Viṣṇu) is the supreme reality, the world (Jagat), Soul (Jīva) are real; and are dependent on or subservient to Him. Both of them conceived God to be a 'PERSON' who is endowed

---

58. K. Narain, Op.Cit., p.123.

59. RSV Bible, Mt: 22:38-40.

60. Martin Buber, Eclipse of God, Trans.M.Friedman, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1957,), PP.96-97. Hereafter cited as EG.

Rarest Archiver

with a personality and infinite number of infinite attributes; and He is an object of worship of man.

1.13.1.THE NATURE OF GOD (ETERNAL THOU-VIṢṆU)--BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber affirms and accepts the nature and attributes of God (God as in Himself) as well as the existence of God;and as for Madhva, the nature and attributes of God (Viṣṇu) is very important concept than that of the question of the existence of God. Both the thinkers try to investigate or inquire, whether it is possible for us to know about the nature of God. So if it is possible, how is it possible is a question to both of them.

Buber affirmed that it is possible for us to know the Eternal Thou in and through the I and Thou relationship with the other Thou (beings). God becomes an object of our knowledge through the I-Thou relationship and everything that becomes present to us.

In Madhva's epistemology we see him defining the reality as, that which can become an object of our knowledge. Therefore he maintains, if we say that Viṣṇu is unknowable then we would be saying that Viṣṇu is not a reality. But the fact is that Viṣṇu is real and He can be known and knowable.

Buber also agrees with Madhva's view holding that the reality of God can be known. Thus he maintains that God, as a reality is knowable in so far as He is real (actual) in the I-Thou relation (of Thous- beings). Persons are real and actual and God is a Being who becomes a person in order to know and be known, to love and be loved by all men. Thus for Buber, it is only in our existence as persons, in our encounter with finite

Rarest Archiver

Thous we meet the Eternal Thou and we do not know nothing of Him outside of this real I-Thou encounter.

Both in Buber and Madhva's understanding, we cannot know an unreality or illusion; and so, the characteristic of every reality is knowablity. Thus God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) is supremely knowable because He is supremely real or actual (in Thous, beings world). Thus Buber and Madhva maintain that one of the chief characteristics of the reality is 'knowablity'. And according to Madhva this is true as far as Viṣṇu is concerned; and knowablity is one of the infinite qualities of God (Viṣṇu) through which He is knowable or known. In his BSBh, Madhva maintains that partial knowablity of God establishes at least partial characteristicability of God (BSBh.I.1.5). On the other hand Buber would argue that the knowledge of the existence of a reality (God) implies some knowledge of the nature of reality (God) in and through the I-Thou relationship (Thou with Thou or man with man). Thus Buber says, 'Eternal Thou (as ultimate reality) is the ground of all I-Thou encounters and behind every Thou whom we meet in the world. The real God is the God who can be addressed, because He is the God who addresses.[61]

Thus we see that both Buber and Madhva affirmed very strongly that we can attain the knowledge of the nature of Eternal Thou and Viṣṇu (God) and their rejected any type of agnostic and skeptical theories.

1.13.2.THE LIMITATION OF OUR KNOWING AND THE KNOWLEDGE OF ETERNAL THOU AND VIṢṆU (GOD)--BUBER AND MADHVA:

---

61. Martin Buber, IT, p.99; Cf. also, Martin Buber, Origin and Meaning of Hassidism, PP.91-92.

Rarest Archiver

Buber and Madhva apparently seem to be differing in their views of knowing the nature of the Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu (God). But both of them affirmed and strongly maintained that it is possible to know God but our knowing Him and our knowledge of the Supreme Being (God) is limited. God is the Absolute Being, suprasensible, and infinite. They hold that though God can be apprehensible to us, yet He is not fully comprehensible to us. Their contention can be explained with an example that though the Supreme Being (God) is like a mountain that can be touched with our hands but our arms cannot encompass it. Buber held that God is the Absolute person and He is the active existential ground of all human persons in the world. In another place Buber says that 'God is not only a person'. Perhaps through this expression Buber means to say that God is beyond all human limitations. What Buber means here is that, we come to know God as person in I-Thou relationship alone and not that the existence of God is dependent on our knowing Him. God is the Mysterium Tremendum who appears and overwhelms; He exists also in His Absolute unbridgeable distance. We cannot discuss God in metaphysical concepts and when we conceptualize God, it is to limit Him. At times no concept can be applied to the Absolute God because our knowledge is limited. God can only be 'EXPERIENCED' and not proved by reason. Thus Buber writes, "I have no metaphysics on which to establish my faith, I have created none for my self, I do not desire any, I need one, I am not capable one". He rejected the rational theology and abstract proofs because our knowledge of God is limited. He says, 'we cannot subject God to man-made laws or constructions to have any

Rarest Archiver

adequate idea about Him and again the Absolute God cannot be fully grasped in dogmas, space and time.

The rational propositions cannot provide full understanding of God. It is clear that all rational systems discovered by man in knowing God have ended up in some or other forms of absurdity or paradoxes. We cannot know God as He is and His Being.[62] Buber maintains that when we try to know about God then we make Him an object. Here what he means is that God cannot be subjected to the laws of human logic and we cannot have an adequate idea of God because our knowledge is limited of Him.

According to Madhva, as Viṣṇu (God) is ananta (unlimited), we cannot know Him fully; and if we know God fully, then He becomes limited called anta (limited). The unlimited Viṣṇu is like the ocean and our human minds are like the pots that are limited. A person may say that he has touched or seen a big mountain, but he must have touched or seen a small portion of the mountain of his experience. Likewise we have limited knowledge of God. As we have already stated, Buber also says, we can only know God through His presence and relationship (God's essence is to be related with us 'Thous') with us and we are unable to know as 'HE IS' (as being of this or that kind' which belongs to the metaphysical concepts) through human reason or metaphysical and logical concepts or scientific analysis or rational discussions.

1.13.3.HUMAN WAYS OF KNOWING THE NATURE OF THE ETERNAL THOU-VIṢṆU (GOD)—BUBER AND MADHVA:

---

[62] . Martin Buber, IT, PP.170-171.

Rarest Archiver

Buber's conception of God is an Absolute Person and The Eternal Thou. He is the ground of all I-Thou relationships of human beings, nature, and spiritual beings. God takes on Himself the personality in order to communicate with us human beings. We come to know God as a person only in I-Thou relationship and not that the existence of God is dependent on our knowing Him. Thus, the I-Thou relationship is the essential characteristic of God. It is in concrete I-Thou relationships with His Thous and creatures that God exists and apart from such a relationship to His creatures (Thous), He is not a God. God does have His independent existence, but to exist in relationship to His creatures is one of His main characteristics. The Eternal Thou manifests Himself through infinite and variety of things and events of everyday life; and all these reveal and speak of the Absolute God. Even nature manifests the creating and self-communicating aspect, the power and glory of the Eternal Thou. Man encounters (knows) Him in every concrete situation of his life; man hears His address for response.

Buber says, 'he who goes out with his whole being to meet his Thou (God) and carries to it all being that is in the world (creatures, beings) finds Him who cannot be sought.[63] In Madhva's understanding, we can know God and His attributes only through Scriptures (Śruti-Vēdas) or in other words our knowledge and attributes of God is only Scripture-centered; and besides Śruti, we cannot know about the nature of God through any other means of knowledge or cognition. The pratyakṣa (sense experience) and anumāna (reason) cannot give us the knowledge of Viṣṇu at all because Pratyakṣa (sense experience) is limited

---

63. Ibid., p.104.

Rarest Archiver

only to the realities of senses. As God is the Suprasensible Absolute reality, we cannot attain the knowledge of Him through our sense perception. So, we must with reverence approach the sacred texts to attain the knowledge of God. " Janārdhana can be known through right (true -sadāgamas) scriptures (Śruti); and He cannot be apprehended by mere reasoning or by sensuous perception".[64] Viṣṇu is the only primary content of all true scriptures (Vēdas) and all statements, every syllable and words (terms-varṇās) in the sacred scriptures signify and mention Viṣṇu alone. So it is only Śruti (right scriptures-(Sadāgamas)-Vēdas) that give us the right knowledge of God.

The careful research of the concepts of Buber brings us nearer to the views of Madhva. Though Buber held that we can know the nature of God as Eternal Thou through I-Thou relationship, yet he was convinced that this knowledge was also inadequate. So he said, " BUT THIS is the exalted melancholy of our fate (existence) that every Thou (I-Thou) relationship in our world must become an IT".[65] He says that to encounter God lies in the middle of the concrete world (of between, presence, community, encounter) and it can be the 'WAY'. The God of the Biblical faith and of religious experience cannot be described or defined and He cannot be inferred from anything at all. So also, one need not go to the beginning of history or the nature around to find God for, He cannot be deduced from anything. In agreement to Madhva, Buber affirms that, one can also know God perfectly by faith and revelation (Bible, Ten Commandments of God). Thus, faith and revelation both are necessary; faith

---

64. S.S. Rāghavachār, VTV, No.3, p.2.

65. Martin Buber, IT, p.31.

Rarest Archiver

and reason must together aspire to find God; reason is only a part of the whole of man. Buber praises the Gospel according to St.John in the New Testament of the Bible and maintained that the Gospel of St.John is really the Gospel of I-Thou relationship. Here is a truer verse in this mystical verse as, "I AM THOU AND THOU ART I'. The Father (God) and son (Jesus) like in being- we may even say God and man, like in being- are the indissoluble real pair, the two bearers of the primal relation which from God to man looking and hearing between both is termed knowledge and love".[66]

In Buber's opinion, the Biblical (Bible) revelation (of the Old Testament) primarily gives us the adequate and perfect knowledge of the Eternal Thou (God). And our pursuit of knowing God (of everything) cannot be merely based on rational evidences as the traditional philosophy that tends to eliminate all tension and mystery of reality (of God), because it only emphasizes on reasons and interrogations. Only rational propositions cannot provide full knowledge (understanding) of God, because reason is only a part of the whole man. Rational metaphysics and man-made laws do not give adequate knowledge of God. What Buber also tries to portray is that speaking about the knowledge of God from the angle of human reason also, we receive the knowledge of God only through the scriptures (Bible-revelation), which means here is that it is God who puts into our minds the knowledge of Himself.

1.13.4.THE HUMAN WAYS OF EXPRESSING THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE ETERNAL THOU-VISNU (GOD):

---

66. Ibid., p.111.

Rarest Archiver

Madhva in his writings employs the 'Via Negativa' (The way of negation) to predicate the attributes to Viṣṇu and to know and express the knowledge of Him. We human beings without our intellect are unable to attain the divine substance that exceeds in its form and nature. Though we cannot apprehend the nature of God by knowing what it is like, yet we can have some knowledge of God by coming to know of Him what 'HE IS NOT'. Therefore, by successively denying to God anything that refers (belongs) to contingent (accidental, conditional) or finite beings, we arrive at the nature of God.[67] Visnu cannot be referred with the creatural attributes or qualities (like composition, limitation, temporality etc). God's attributes are beyond the three qualities (guṇās) of prakṛti (the primordial matter) such as, sattva, rajas, tamas etc; and therefore we have to deny to Viṣṇu all the empirical or creaturely guṇas that are pervaded (permeated) by these three qualities of prakṛti. That attributes or qualities of Viṣṇu are transcendental, transempirical and spiritual whereby our human language cannot adequately describe Him at all. The 'Nēti Nēti' (not this, not this) concept is to be applied here. The way of negation can be explained through an example, that a person who has tasted a Kashmīry apple may find it hard to describe its taste; yet he says, it is not like mango or pineapple. In the same manner, the description of Brahman (Viṣṇu) is also the negative description that comes to be more relevant and adequate than positive description of Viṣṇu. But the negative description of Viṣṇu does not make Him

---

67. Puthiadam, God, p.49.

Rarest Archiver

Nirguaṇa (qualitiless), but it only shows that Viṣṇu is beyond the comprehension and expression of human mind.

Likewise, Buber too [redacted] seems to follow the way of negation like that of Madhva. Thus in one place he says, " God is not only a person'. Here Buber means to say that 'God is beyond all human limitations (finitudes, corporeality, creation, limitation, temporality of beings-Thous, are implicitly referred here). God is beyond our human comprehension of Him. Regarding the 'relationship' Buber maintains that 'the relationship depends for being to be what it is upon some relation to another and therefore it (relation) is limited. Thus, it is on this kind of paradox or way of negation in a way, Buber also builds his system. The way of negation here can be a 'kind of paradox' in Buber. Thus here the relationship is also an imperfection and God (The Eternal Thou) is without relationship. Hence it is implied here in Buber that the concept of a kind of paradox as the positive description of the knowledge of God.[69] Further, Buber speaks of God only in His relationship to His creatures, which is a paradox sometimes and in this paradox (negative description) He is Absolute Thou, Mystery and Mysterium Tremendum. Philosophical critics stated that Buber failed to give specific reasons and correct principles to discover the real Theophanies of the Absolute God in this world. In this statement itself we can infer that the negative description of God becomes more adequate than the positive description of God. Thus he says, 'we may come near to God, but we are not near to

---

[69]. Martin Buber, Replies to my Critics, in Schillp,PMB.p.717.

Rarest Archiver

unveiling the being of God and solving its riddle.[70] He cannot be fully grasped in space, Time, and dogmas.

The above concepts of Madhva and Buber can also be seen in the explanation of B.N.K.Sharma as, "The function of an attribute is to describe a thing as it is. This might be done positively or negatively. In the Śrutis we have texts that ascribe positive attributes like 'satyakāmatva' (one whose will always prevails); they also ascribe to Brahman negative attributes like 'apahatapāpāmatva' (freedom from sin and limitation) etc. It makes no difference to the characteristicability (Saviśeṣatva) of Brahman whether the attributes admitted are positive or negative in form".[71]

Thus we see in Madhva and Buber that through the way of the dictum of *'not this not this-'Neti Neti'* they posit the knowledge of God.

1.14.LIKENESS OR PARALLELLISM (ANALOGICAL) PREDICATION OF GOD--BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber and Madhva affirmed and predicated various qualities (attributes) to God, like Eternality, Creatorship, Redemption, Intelligence, Lordship and Absolute Person etc. Both Buber and Madhva were aware of the problem of affirmation, i.e., the problem of difference and similarity while predicating attributes to God. This means, both Buber and Madhva agree that there is analogical similarity and difference between God's attributes and that of creatures in the world.

According to Madhva, there is similarity and difference between the qualities (attributes) of Viṣṇu and that of finite

---

70. Martin Buber, IT.p. 142.
71. B.N.K.Sharma, Teaching, p. 113.

Rarest Archiver

creatures (like Jīvas Svatantrya (independence), Vijñāna (knowledge) and Ānanda (Bliss) and many others are the attributes of Viṣṇu. Likewise the creatures too are endowed with (being) knowledge (vijñāna) and bliss (ānanda) etc. Here we see some similarity (analogy) between Viṣṇu and creatures (Jīvas). In the first place we see that between Viṣṇu and creatures (Jīvas) there is the relation of Bimba-Pratibimba (reflection of the reflected-reflected object to its reflection). Like a mirror that reflects the Sun vaguely, in the same manner the creatures (the Jīvas- souls) also in their limitation reflect Viṣṇu and His perfections. Secondly, we see in the Śruti (Scriptures) that the attributes of Viṣṇu and creatures (Jīvas) named after with the same terms like Jñāna (knowledge) Ānanada (Bliss). So the attributes of Viṣṇu and of creatures (Jīvas) are of the same nature and order that we know them from empirical reality; and we know creatures from worldly and empirical experiences as well.

According to Buber, among many attributes (creator, redeemer, The Eternal Thou) of God, being a Person is one of the attributes that is directly known to us of God in His relationship to us. To know God as person is the religious, relational and empirical language. Here it does not mean to reduce the Absolute to the personal (human, empirical) but rather it means that God has become addressable where He enters into the relationship as the Absolute Person whom we call God.[72] Thus it is difficult for the concept of personal being to declare God's nature (we cannot speak of God in human, empirical terminologies). Spinoza had the fear to describe God as person,

---

72. Martin Buber, IT, PP.96-97.

Rarest Archiver

because in his opinion, we would be reducing God to the personal (human) alone. To dispel this fear of Spinoza Buber maintains that it is both necessary and permitted to say, "God is also a person.[73]

Buber also holds that 'the Absolute Person (God) cannot be limited.[74] The Absolute Person cannot be relativized as well. It should not be understood that we can know God as *He is* and in His Being (God is far superior and Transempirical to human understanding and terminologies). God is the person *par excellence*. Therefore the definition of human person cannot be applied to God because the definition of man has limitations of a creature in nature. God creates man (creatures) as independent (free) opposite (finite) beings, which means that human beings are dependent on God (in I-Thou relationship). The analogy of the Sun and reflection can be applied here. Malcolm Diamond comes with the analogy from Platonic thought to explain what exactly Buber would mean. Here he says that Plato's analogy of the Sun explains the relation of the encounter with the Eternal Thou (God) in relationship. So just as Sun is the most visible of all objects and the source of objects that makes other things to become visible (vaguely), so also the Eternal Thou is the Supreme and the power that underlies all I-Thou relationships.

Madhva also shows us many differences that exist between Viṣnu's attributes and of Jīvas (creatures). The attributes of Viṣnu are Transempirical and that of Jīvas empirical; the attributes of Viṣnu are perfect but that of Jīvas, limited and imperfect. According to Bṛh.Up., "all Jīvas (creatures, beings)

---

73. Ibid., IT, PP.168-169.
74. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., p.355).

Rarest Archiver

exist by a drop of the ānanda (bliss) of God (Cf.Bṛh.Up.VI.3.32). "All other beings from Śrī to the least blade of grass enjoy only a drop of bliss.[76]

Viṣṇu is the ocean of Bliss, where as the Jīvas (creatures, beings) are like a small pot of water in their relation to the mighty ocean; and they in a very limited way participate in the bliss of Viṣṇu. The attributes (qualities) of Viṣṇu sustain, support and regulate as sources to the attributes of Jīvas. The attributes of creatures (Jīvas) are known by perception and from worldly experience; and they are expressed by human words. In the words of B.N.K. Sharma, "Madhva also takes special pains to point out that though the attributes of God are transcendental and trnas-empirical, they are, nevertheless, designated by the same terms as are applied to corresponding empirical qualities. This is merely symbolic and intended to give us some idea of them, however limited, and inadequate (BSBh.iii.2.32-34). The transcendental cannot be fully made known or represented by empirical categories and epithets. Hence the Transempirical and limitless attributes of Viṣṇu are not open to perception or comprehensible to human mind; and they are inexpressible by human words or terminologies. The ānanda and vijñāna of Viṣṇu are the essences of one another where as at the empirical level of the attributes of Jīvas (creatures) it is not so; and they (ānanda and vijñāna) do not partake in the nature of one another. Therefore it is clear in Madhva that the Ānanda and Vijñāna of Viṣṇu are para(superior) and different from the empirical ānanda and vijāna of the Creatures (Jīvas).

---

[76]. BSBh, I.ii.15; I.Puthiadam, God, p.51.

Rarest Archiver

Buber also says, God cannot be sought because He has no place (in the human terminology). The God of Biblical faith and of religious experience cannot be described or defined of inferred from anything at all. He cannot be deduced from anything and He cannot be expressed. When we speak of God we are prone to turn Him into a being besides other existing beings and as a thing among other things of existence (human empirical existence).[77] Everything is included in God and in turn God is not included in the totality of all. God comprises the universe and the universe does not comprise God.[78] No limitation can come upon Him, as He is the Absolute person, either from us or from our relationship with one another.[79] By His nature the Eternal Thou is 'Eternally Thou' and only our nature (human nature- we) compel us to draw Him in to the world and talk of Him.[80] The Eternal Thou by its nature cannot become It (objectifying in human terminology), for by its nature it cannot be established in measure and bounds, not even in the measure of the immeasurable, or the bounds of boundless being; for by its nature it cannot be understood as a sum of qualities; not even as an infinite sum of qualities raised to a transcendental level; for it can be found neither in nor out of the world; for it cannot be experienced, or thought of; for we miss Him who is, if we say 'I believe that He is, 'He' is also metaphor.[81]

---

77. Martin Buber, Replies to my Critics, in Schillp, PMB, p.713; Cf. also, B.N.K. Sharma, Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya, (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1991), p.348; Cf. also, BSBh. III.2.33.
78. Martin Buber, IT, p.122.
79. Ibid., IT, PP.169-170.
80. Ibid., IT, p.128.
81. Ibid., IT, p.143.

Rarest Archiver

God cannot be subjected to the laws of human logic and man cannot have an adequate idea of God. Paschal had called God as the God of philosophers in his confession of 1654. But Buber rejects Paschal's understanding and opines that God is distinct from the human intellectuals and from the God of philosophers' concept. God is the 'Wholly Other', He remains as the unknown God to man.

Both Buber and Madhva are similar in analogical sense (parallel) in asserting (analogical predication) or designating the perfections of the Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu and of creatures (Jīvas, beings); and implicitly are similar of their predication of attributes to God. Both agree that the empirical usages like, knowledge, bliss etc. are referred to the Transempirical attributes of God (Eternal Thou- Viṣṇu). In his BSBh, Madhva brings in the analogy of 'Padāvat' (BSBS.III.2.32). The word 'Pāda' (foot of Brahman) is applied to Brahman's Svarūpaṁśás (Nārāyaṇa, Hari etc) and Brahman's Bhinnaṁśás (Jīvas, souls) in the Śrutis. Thus the Transempirical and transcendental attributes of God are designated by the ordinary empirical qualities that may give us some idea of God's nature though they are inadequate or limited in their own nature.

Both Buber and Madhva hold that though the empirical usage of the Transempirical terminologies are inadequate or limited for our limited human understanding to express, explain or to know God's nature, yet for us humans the usage of the empirical terminologies and concepts are the ONLY ways by which we form some idea of God. According to both, that our knowledge of God's knowledge, bliss, eternality, intelligence, Lordship

Rarest Archiver

etc are inadequate, limited, incorrect, but it does not mean that we have the false knowledge of God.

Further Buber makes a clear distinction between the two ways of knowing the nature of the Eternal Thou- the I-Thou relationship (Existential, Anthropological, relational) and Revelation (Bible, Decalogue). He, in his existential philosophical thinking does not mainly depend on revelation, but he sees the Biblical faith of the Old Testament of the Bible as the event of God's I-Thou relationship with the people of Israel. Whatever may be God, but He enters into I-Thou relationship with us men and creatures in the world. Though, through the biblical faith of the Bible we get the perfect knowledge of God (God's nature is of I-Thou relationship alone) and of His infinite attributes, yet through relational experience (I-Thou) of man with man, man with the nature and reasoning we get the analogical (similarity) knowledge of the attributes and nature of the Eternal Thou. But Madhva's main view is that we get the knowledge of the nature and attributes of Viṣnu (even analogical knowledge) through Śruti (scripture), Smṛti, devotees, and other sources of cognition.

1.15.THE BODY OF THE ETERNAL THOU AND VIṢNU—BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber's conception of the body of the Eternal Thou is very much similar to Madhva's understanding of the body of Viṣnu. In Buber's opinion, God is the Absolute Thou who shines out in every being (Thous) but He transcends all. The Eternal Thou though is met in each particular Thou (man), yet, He cannot be fixed in any of them (material bodies). The Eternal Thou does not become 'IT' (bodies) when others do. It is Eternally Thou

Rarest Archiver

(Person par excellence). The body of God cannot be limited because He is Absolute Person. The 'Personhood' of God that we understand in human terminology is not its true nature; and about Him we know nothing. The Absolute Thou is not a person in any finite, person-alongside-other-persons sense of the term.[82]

As God is the person par excellence, the definition of human person cannot be applied to God because the definition of man has limitations of a creature in nature. Though every sphere is compassed in the Eternal Thou, yet the Eternal Thou is not compassed in them.[83] Everything is included in God and in turn God is not included in the totality of all. God comprises the universe and the universe does not comprise God.[84] By His very nature (as the Eternal Thou) cannot become IT (material objects, beings etc). We come to know God as the Absolute Person (in I-Thou relationship) alone and not as His existence is dependent on our (human) knowing of Him. God is an abstract Being and He is unrelated to anything but related to Himself. No human concept can be applied to the Absolute God.

Madhva says, in his BSBh, that 'The Vaiṣṇava sacred texts teach that Viṣṇu has an intellect, a mind, members and sub-members (BSBh, II.ii.4); and the ancient Vaiṣṇavism taught that Viṣṇu has a body, pleasant odour, luster of knowledge etc. So Madhva affirms that Viṣṇu has a body; and the sacred texts teach that He has a body. But some of the teachings of these texts are in line with our daily experience. So, Madhva removes from Viṣṇu the material bodies and holds that the body of Viṣṇu is not

---

82. Maurice Friedmann, Op.Cit.,PP.355-356.
83. Martin Buber,IT, p.130.
84. Ibid., p.122; Ibid., IT, p.143).

Rarest Archiver

corporeal or earthly bodies that are material in nature; "The Lord is completely different from matter"(BSBh, III.ii.15). If Viṣṇu were to possess these perceptible, external, tangible forms and colours, He cannot be eternal, because such tangible forms or colours are the products of the elements of matter (prime matter) that are destructible or can be annihilated. The Lord is formless (arūpa) and He pervades over the matter and is the inner principle of the activity of matter. Since the word body usually means a body that comes from the union of male and female principle, it is better to say that *Viṣṇu has no body* (Cf. Jyayatīrtha on BSBh.III.ii.14&15). But still since the Scriptures speak of the body of Viṣṇu, we cannot easily do away with the word. What we have to keep in mind is the otherness (from matter) of the Lord's body. Unlike us, Viṣṇu is not subject to birth and death, change and decay.

Positively speaking, the body of Viṣṇu consists in nothing but His attributes. "Nārāyaṇa, whose body is nothing but the totality of his attributes" (AV.I.1). Viṣṇu's head, arms, and trunk are made out of being (Existence, Sat), knowledge (Vijñāna), consciousness (cit), and bliss (ānanda).[85] Thus, only the infinite attributes of Viṣṇu form His body. These attributes and members are not distinct from one another or from Viṣṇu. Viṣṇu is the indwelling principle of the realities of spiritual selves (souls) and matter and these do not form His real body at all.

Further more, Buber implicitly accepts that the Eternal Thou is endowed with many attributes but not like Madhva who explicitly mentions that Viṣṇu's body formed by the totality of

---

[85]. BSBh.II.ii.4; Puthiadam, God, PP.50-51.

Rarest Archiver

his attributes (AV.I.1). According to Madhva only an embodied being like Viṣṇu can enter into causal relationship with the world.[86] Therefore in Madhva's understanding Viṣṇu should have a body in order to enter into the causal relationship with the world. He maintains, as regards the creation (sṛṣṭi) of the world, as Viṣṇu induces or works on Prakṛti (primordial matter of pre-existing matter), He needs a body of His creative activities, sustenance and preservations of spiritual and material entities and thereby establishes His (master-servant) relation with all His creatures of His sṛṣṭi.

1.16.THE ETERNAL THOU AND VISNU ARE SAGUṆA (WITH ATTRIBUTES) AND SAVIŚEṢA (QUALIFIED) PERSONALITY-- BUBER AND MADHVA:

According to Buber and Madhva, the Eternal Thou and Viṣṇu (God) is full of infinite and manifold attributes (qualities). Buber followed the Biblical faith of the Old Testament of the Bible and Decalogue in ascribing (implicitly) manifold attributes to the Eternal Thou. Madhva on the other hand tried to disprove the Advaitic understanding of Nirguṇa (attributeless) or Nirviśeṣa (qualitiless), and taught that the whole Śruti (true scriptures- sadāgamas) and Smṛti teach only about one Absolute Being; and He is Viṣṇu identical with Brahman. Viṣṇu, taught by the sacred texts, is the abode of all good qualities. Nowhere do we find a distinction being made between an attributeless (Nirguṇa) Brahman and a Brahman with qualities (Saguṇa). It is wrong to say that one and the same Brhman is said to be endowed with qualities of producing the

---

86. Puthiadam, God. P.50.

Rarest Archiver

world, and Brhaman is said to be attributeless, unseen and inexpressible.[87] Thus Madhva affirms Saguṇa (qualities) Saviśēṣa (qualified) personality to Viṣṇu. Thus in all the writings, one of the loved words of Madhva is 'Pūrna' (sarva-guṇa-pūrna)—Viṣṇu is the fullness, the ocean of all good qualities and devoid of any defects (Nirdoṣa).[88] Hence both Buber and Madhva accept that the Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu is full of attributes and all Excellencies (Sarva-guṇa-pūrna- person par excellence) and without any defects.

In the strong argument of Madhva, Brahman (Viṣṇu) cannot be Nirguṇa (attributeless); so by Nirguṇa he understands as Sūnya or qualitiless Being. But in reality there cannot be any object existing without a quality and existence without guṇa (quality) or else it may mean nothingness (sūnya). Thus Viṣṇu as the reality cannot be nothingness or Sunya; and He has to have qualities or qualified personality (Saviśēṣa). And again Madhva held that the Saviśēṣa (qualified) objects alone can really be apprehended; and since we can know Viṣṇu, He should be qualified personality (Being).

1.17.THE ATTRIBUTES OF THE ETERNAL THOU AND VIṢṆU-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber and Madhva predicated and affirmed many attributes (qualities) to (the Eternal Thou- Viṣṇu) God such as Eternality (nitya), Par excellence, Absoluteness, Mysterium Tremendum, Wholly Otherness, Jñāna (knowledge), Sat (Being) ānandam (bliss), Sarvagata (omnipresence). They teach that because God is infinite (Eternal), He should have manifold and infinite

---

87. Tattvadīpika, PP.40-43; I. Puthiadam, God, p.49.
88. Puthiadam, God. PP.49-50.

Rarest Archiver

number of attributes (qualities). The Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu (God) is self-existent reality and therefore He exists through His (unbounded) independent Excellencies (person par excellence) and perfection without defects. Buber teaches that, the Eternal Thou (Mysterium Tremendum) confers being, existence, presence, relationship (I-Thou). Both Buber and Madhva understand that the attributes of God are transcendental, Transempirical and non-material beyond the empirical perception of material creatures. Buber held that the Eternal Thou though incorporated, He is beyond the limitations of the material (empirical) beings. In Madhva's opinion too, (as he interprets the 'Nirguaṇa' of Viṣṇu), the attributes of Viṣṇu that form His body are beyond the three guṇas of primordial matter (prakṛti) such as, sattva, rajas and tamas.

Though Buber and Madhva are very similar in their view about the conception and predication of the attributes to the Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu, yet, there is a slight difference in the way they affirm attributes to God. We find in Buber's existential (I-Thou relationship or anthropological philosophy) philosophy that the most important quality of God is the 'Eternal Thou in I-Thou relational existence'; and from these concepts, Buber proceeds to speak of existence, presence, community and other perfections of the Eternal Thou. But in Madhva, Viṣṇu is to be understood in 'essence' (Madhva is an essentialist philosopher); and the Svatantraya (independence) of Viṣṇu is one of the foremost attributes; or in other words the independence of Viṣṇu is His essence.

Both Buber and Madhva held that the God is Eternal Thou, underlying principle of everything, infinite, omnipotent,

Rarest Archiver

Mysterium Tremendum, the Wholly Other, independent, Creator, revealer and redeemer of all; and He is the transcendent and immanent principle of everything. Though the Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu is present in all creatures, beings, yet they may not be present essentially and substantially in all that is 'NOT HIM' (God). What Buber means here is that the Eternal Thou is not present in the world of I-IT relations where Thous (beings) are objectified. And Madhva supports the same concept as that Viṣṇu is not present in those who do not accept (atheists) Him to be Viṣṇu and the real Brahman. Buber maintained that the Eternal Thou is the most perfect reality and He is different from all other Thous (beings) is as much the Thous may become IT; by nature and reality the Eternal Thou cannot become IT at all. Though the Eternal Thou is in I-Thou relation with the creatures (Thous), yet He is not in them; He is different from all other Thous (contingent beings) because each Thou is just a reflection of the Eternal Thou. Therefore Buber sees that each Thou is distinct from the Eternal Thou. Madhva too held that Prakṛti (the primordial matter) and the finite spirits are eternally distinct from Viṣṇu. Viṣṇu alone is independent (svatantra) and every other finite spirit (Jīvas) or matter (prakṛti) is dependent (asvatantrya) on Viṣṇu. Therefore what similarity we see here in Buber and Madhva is that though Buber was influenced by the mysticism of Echart and Hassidism that held the concept of the identity of soul and God, and Madhva too to certain extent was influenced by other mystical writings and traditions of his times especially of Purāṇas, Bhāgavata, Epics etc. which to some extent identified the Soul with God; and again both Buber and Madhva were mystics and were accused of their writings

Rarest Archiver

as containing mystical writings (soul God identity texts), yet very strongly they emphasized the fact that no finite creature (being, Thous, entities) can be identified or identical with the Eternal Thou or Viṣṇu.

1.18.THE UNITY OF THE ETERNAL THOU AND VIṢṆU-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber as a Jewish philosopher and Madhva as the staunch believer in the supremacy of Viṣṇu held that the Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu is one, simple and no duality; God has no multiplicity or composition in Him. Buber maintained that the term 'Eternal Thou' is not a substitutive word for the word 'God' which cannot be replaced by any.[89] God, according to both the thinkers is His own existence and does not depend on the others for His existence. He is His own existence; it is He who causes existence in other beings (sadbhāva). Madhva affirms, "That from which the birth etc., of the world is the essential definition of Viṣṇu alone". The definition of AV.97, 98 implicitly affirms that Viṣṇu alone and not another being is the cause of the world.[90]

Buber and Madhva both advocate the monotheistic concept of God. Though Buber calls Yahweh, the God of the Old Testament of the Bible of Israel as the Eternal Thou, he does not change the concept of one God. According to him, in whatever terminology we may call God, God is the Eternal Thou; and it is not a substitutive term for God. Madhva too is similar to Buber's concept of God. He strongly affirms and maintains Viṣṇu to be the only independent reality and as the only God. Viṣṇu may

---

89. Martin Buber, IT, p.100.
90. Puthiadam, God, p.50.

Rarest Archiver

manifest Himself in infinite and various ways or He may be called by the infinite number of names, yet all His manifestations and forms are always identical with one another; and there cannot be any slightest difference between any of His manifestations or forms. Because of this doctrine, some of the Indian thinkers have called Madhva as the staunch and rigorous monotheist in his concept of God.[91]

1.19.THE CONCEPT OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE ETERNAL THOU AND VIṢṆU (GOD) -BUBER AND MADHVA:

In the thoughts of Buber and Madhva the Eternal Thou is the abode of all auspicious attributes. In Madhva, the most divine of all perfections that sets Viṣṇu (God) apart from all other beings is the independence or freedom. [92] Both Madhva and Buber strongly emphasize that God is unconditionally and absolutely independent and He is called in Madhva's terminology as Sarva-Svatantrea. God is for them ekam-evadvitiyam (one without a second one). According to Madhva, as Viṣṇu alone is the independent Being, all other eternal realities like Jīvas and Prakṛit (primordial matter) are eternally dependent on Viṣṇu for their essential Svarupa (nature), satta (existence), pramiti (knowledge) and pravṛtti (activity). It is only according to the will (iccha) of Viṣṇu the reality of all these beings exist; and His will is the essential condition and underlying principle for their existence.[93] And again it is because of His will alone these realities can be extinct or annihilated. Viṣṇu's

---

91. Krishna Rao. C.R, Śrī Madhva, His Life and Doctrine, (Śrī Mādhva Muni Sēva Sangha, 1929), p.104.
92. Puthiadam, God, p.55.
93. BG.Bh.II.24, IV.12 etc.

Rarest Archiver

independence cannot be affected in any way by the eternality of Jīva or prakṛti (Primordial matter).

In the system of Buber too God is the Eternal Thou (reality). This Eternal Thou has created this Thous (beings), beings, and spiritual entities in the world. The Thou-beings, spiritual entities depend on this Eternal Thou for their existence (in relationship) sustenance and redemption; and it is according to the will of Him they exist and except for His will (I-Thou relationship) they would not exit. Buber, by calling God as the Eternal Thou, has brought out more clearly the independence of God.

1.20.THE KNOWLEDGE AND WILL OF THE ETERNAL THOU AND VIṢṆU-BUBER AND MADHVA:

The Eternal Thou of Buber is all knowing and omniscient; and Madhva's God (Viṣṇu) is also omniscient (sarvajña). 'Viṣṇu is omniscient' is a clear teaching of Śruti and 'sarvajña' is an epithet of the Lord in Madhva system. From the fact that He is conscious and omniscient, His form is that of unmixed knowledge (najñānamsrajñāna) (BSBh.II.ii.41, III.ii.16). In the Pramānalakṣaṇa the knowledge of Viṣṇu is marked off as eternal, embracing the totality of beings, and totally independent. All other beings know in dependence on Viṣṇu. Perfect clarity, distinctness, and immediacy in their highest degree mark off Viṣṇu's knowledge. Therefore the knowledge of Viṣṇu is immediate and actual. The knowledge of Viṣṇu is creative of the world.[94]

Viṣṇu is supremely intelligent Being because He has created a universe of intelligent entities or beings. According to

---

94. Puthiadam, God, p.53.

Rarest Archiver

Madhva, the iccha (will) follows knowledge [95], and it is the knowledge that produces the desire that is also called iccha. Because Viṣṇu is intelligent, He is also iccha (will). Viṣṇu is the efficient cause of the world and all creatures, because He has intelligence and will (iccha). According to Jayatīrtha freedom means following of one's own iccha (will). Viṣṇu alone is supremely free cause of the world and of creatures. He possesses Himself totally, acts fully and knows fully about Himself which is called the self-determination. Viṣṇu in a way freedom Himself. All these concepts of Madhva as regards Viṣṇu are also similar to the Eternal Thou of Buber.

1.21.THE ETERNAL THOU AND VIṢṆU IS PERSON-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber described God in deliberate paradox as the 'Absolute Person', i.e., the person who cannot be limited. God is a person not because of His individual and incommunicable substance or rational nature but because of His relationship with human beings. The description of God as person is indispensable for everyone who like himself means by God not a principle (although mystics like Echart sometimes identify Him with 'Being') and Buber means by 'God' not an idea (although philosophers like Plato at times could hold that He was this) but who rather means by 'God' Him-who -whatever else He may be - enters into a direct relation with us men in creative, revealing and redeeming acts, and thus makes it possible for us to enter into a direct relation with Him. This ground and meaning of our existence constitutes mutuality arising again and again, such as man subsists only between persons.[96] Thus, in Buber's

---

95. B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy of Madhva, p.38.
96. Martin Buber, IT, p.168.

Rarest Archiver

understanding, God becomes person (in the anthropomorphic sense!) through entering into direct relationship with men; He becomes so in order to meet human beings. Thus it is possible to speak of God as a person in the religious language (spiritual) and relationship.[97]

Madhva too held God (Viṣṇu) not [illegible] as an abstract reality but He is conceived to be divine person on the model and terminology of human person (but spiritually in the religious language); and again the personality of God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) is the totality of His attributes or qualities. Sharma would say, 'The Divine personality constitutes such a centrality of reference, endowed with the faculties of cognition, conation and activity, as part of its being- a being whose *esse* is to be conscious, to experience, to think, will, love and control the universe through rational purpose. Sharma clarifies the terminology of God as 'Person' in Madhva. The term 'Person', as applied to Brahman (Viṣṇu), should, therefore, be distinguished carefully from the circumscribed (enclosed or outlined) connotation of the term as a spiritual being embodied (cloth with-body) in a psycho-physical tenement (dwelling). Limitation *is no essential constituent of personality*. It all depends. We may understand God to be a great center of consciousness, will, force and action, -- as a unit whose strength and capacities are beyond measurement or conception (Cf. Madhva.GB.ii.72; RV.viii.99.1; NS.p.421). If the Supreme Reality is not to be a mere indeterminate mass of non-willing, non-thinking and non-acting being, described as Saccidānanda, *just for courtesy's sake*, we must recognize, with Madhva, that *it is both knowledge*

---

97. Martin Buber, EG.PP.96-97.

Rarest Archiver

and knower, bliss and the blissful. There is nothing anthropomorphic (attributing human form and personality to God) about Madhva's conception of God as a Person, everything about whom is non-material (spiritual). He has by definition, no form of gross or subtle matter (Cf.Varaha xxxiv.40; VTV.iii). Madhva brings together a number of texts from the Upaniṣads and Purāṇas, in support of such a dynamic conception of the Divine personality.[98] According to Madhva, Viṣṇu is the God whom devotees can offer prayers, worship Him and can establish through devotion (Bhakti) the interpersonal relationship with Him; Viṣṇu in turn loves His devotees (creatures), gives them grace (prasāda) and grants them salvation (mukti).

1.22.THE RELATION OF GOD (ETERNAL THOU -VIṢṆU) TO HIS ATTRIBUTES-BUBER AND MADHVA:

The argument of Buber and Madhva is that the manifold God's perfections are identical with Him in reality. The divine perfections are identical with one another as well as with God in His essence (nature) or Being. As it is already stated, the attributes of God form God's essential nature and they are the expression of the being of God. At this juncture B.N.K. Sharma also writes that these attributes of God are not separate from the essence of God. God is not a "bare something" qualified or clothed with a number of attributes from without. We have seen that Madhva's conception of substance as an identity in difference, maintained by the self-differentiating capacity of intrinsic Viśeṣas enables him smoothly to preserve the integrality of being of the Supreme Person, in and through His

---

98. Mund Up.ii.2.7; B.N.K. Sharma, Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya.p.344.

Rarest Archiver

numerous attributes which are an expression of His Being and not so many externals attached to Him.[99] All this does not mean that there are no attributes of goodness, beauty, omniscience, sovereignty, bliss, etc., as a matter of fact in the Supreme Lord. It is only a significant negation of the otherness (pṛthakatva) of the attributes from the Lord. It does not, therefore, reduce Brahman (Viṣṇu) to 'Nirviśeṣa' as in Advaita. According to Madhva God has His own body and limbs (This is from the Ekāyana Śruti of the Pancarātra tradition. After Madhva, it has been quoted by Vedānta Deśika). This means that He has a spiritual form with its own instruments of knowledge and activity that is all one of knowledge and bliss (cf. Ekāyana Śruti; Paingi Śruti). Insofar as the several attributes partake of the nature of Brahman they are also inseparable from Him and from one another (Cf. Madhva, GB.ii.22). So far as it is necessary to concede that the supreme Reality has a profound character of its own and is by no means an utter blank, it would be unphilosophical to limit the attributes to six or to eight, as the Naiyayikās have done. Madhva quotes the Svetāsvatara text (vi.8) and that of Bhāgavata (vi.4.48) to refute such a narrow view. Jayatīrtha points out that the six qualities commonly associated with the epithet "Bhagavān", are capable of subsuming the countless other attributes.[100] In his VTV, Madhva says as regards the attributes of God, "One only without a second;

---

[99]. Quoted from Dawes Hicks: Philosophical Basis of Theism,1937.

[100]. GB.ii.72; B.N.K. Sharma, Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya, PP.345-346.

Rarest Archiver

'There is no plurality here".[101] Thus what Madhva intends here and teaches is that Viṣṇu cannot be called as the collection of attributes. There cannot be inner distinction between the attributes and Viṣṇu. There is no distinction among the attributes of God themselves. Hence according to Madhva all the attributes make or constitute the essential nature of Viṣṇu. Buber also maintain that the divine eternality, relationship, presence are ontologically identical with one another and with the Eternal Thou (God). Madhva also further speaks of the unity-in -difference by means of the category of Viśēṣa of Viṣṇu's attributes. According to him, though there are the manifold (infinite) numbers of attributes of Viṣṇu, they also can be distinguished from Viṣṇu through the means of the category of Viśēṣas that which brings in unity-in-difference as regards the attributes of God. Buber also maintained implicitly that all the attributes of the Eternal Thou (God) designate about the one and ɜand the only (same) absolute, Eternal, unique reality, the Eternal Thou. But we the creatures (Thous) understand the Eternal Thou under diverse and various aspects of life.

1.23.THE CONCEPT OF THE INCARNATION AND THE AVTĀRAS OF THE ETERNAL THOU AND VIṢṆU-BUBER AND MADHVA:

In many of his writings Madhva speaks about the manifestations of Viṣṇu through Vyūhas (Viṣṇu's evolutions) and Avatāras (Viṣṇu's incarnations). As regards the concept of God's evolutions (Vyūhas) of Madhva, we find very few similarities or parallels in the philosophy of Buber. As a Jew and brought up in the tradition of the Bible, Buber does not mention or accept any evolutions of God; but he accepts God's functions or acts of

---

[101]. S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV. No.459, p.96.

Rarest Archiver

'coming down', 'revealing', 'redeeming' and 'relating' with the humanity of the world. Further, we find a difference between the Avatāra (incarnation) concept of Madhva and that of Buber. Madhva accepts the doctrine of the ten earthly manifestations of Viṣṇu (Daśa-Avatāras). These ten earthly manifestations (Daśa-Avatāras) according to Madhva are merely *manifestations* of God (Viṣṇu). Here in the ten manifestations Viṣṇu does not change but He is the one and the same Viṣṇu who appears in different forms in this world. Hence these different Avatāras (manifestations) are not really (truly) creatures (man etc) but merely Viṣṇu putting on the appearance of Man or creatures. All these different forms of manifestations are only Viṣṇu; and these avatāras of Viṣṇu are equal to Him in everything. The true nature remains unchanged in all these different manifestations. Thus we see, between Viṣṇu and His Avatāras there is equality in His manifold attributes and there is the identity of His essential nature (savrūpa). Therefore in all the manifestations of Viṣṇu, there is only one nature that is Viṣṇu's divine nature; and this divine nature of Viṣṇu in no way can be mistaken with or brought into contact with our human nature (what we are or creatures are). Therefore in all the avatāras (manifestations) of Viṣṇu, there is no real change of Himself, but there is only change in appearance of Him. Viṣṇu is not truly born in the form of His manifestation, but He appears to be born in the avatāras. Viṣṇu does not really die in Avatāras but appears to be dying in avatāras. He appears to be sorrowing in His avataras but really He does not sorrow. Viṣṇu wears the human body just to fulfill His purpose of manifestation (avatāra). Once Viṣṇu finishes His functioning in any avatāra,

Rarest Archiver

He becomes invisible from the face of the human world. So the birth of Viṣṇu in Avatāras is called Anukhyōtpatti (secondary birth) or pradurbhāva (manifestation). Viṣṇu does all these because of His play or līla.

Buber as a Jewish-religious philosopher believes in the principle that God becomes a person through entering into direct relationship with men. He becomes person in order to meet human beings in the history of humanity and the world. 'God becoming man', - by this Buber does not mean here in the Christian concept of God who manifests Himself in the person of Jesus Christ. God is a Being who becomes a person in order to know and be known, to love and be loved by all men.

According to Buber, the manifestation of the Eternal Thou (God) is to be encountered in the form of persons (Thous). But man (creatures, Thous) is not God but merely God puts on the appearance of Thous (person). The nature and the essence of God just appear to be in the form of person in I-Thou relationship because the form of God can never be changed, as He is the Eternal Thou. So, between God and His manifestation in the form of person (Thous) there is equality in His attributes and there is identity of the essential divine nature as well. The divine nature of God can be found in man but that does not mean that God can change His divine nature to the IT (matter) nature. Thus Buber says, 'The Eternal Thou by its nature cannot become IT".[102] So, though Buber holds that if the Absolute God was not become one in creating man, in order to love and be loved by Him- in order to love me and be loved by me [103], yet, Buber accepts that

---

[102]. Martin Buber, IT, p.99.
[103]. Martin Buber, EG, p.60.

Rarest Archiver

there is no real change in the Eternal Thou's nature but only appearance of change. Thus, though, Buber does not accept the ten avataras of God (as in Madhva), yet he accepts many of Madhva's concepts of God's incarnation and His purpose.

Both Buber and Madhva agree that morally and religiously the incarnations (manifestations - avatāras) of God are without defects (Nirdoṣa). We find some apparent agreement between Buber and Madhva as regards the purpose of God's incarnations. Buber's Eternal Thou incarnates (spiritually) as a person in order to have I-Thou relationship with men, to know and be known, to love and be loved by all men. He is a person because of His relationship with human beings and creatures. Buber says, "The description of God as person is indispensable for everyone. God is not a principle or idea, but who (whatever else he may be)- enters into a direct relation with us men in creative, revealing and redeeming acts, and thus makes it possible for us to enter into a direct relation with him. This ground and meaning of our existence constitutes mutuality, arising again and again, such as man subsist only between persons.[104]

According to Madhva, Viṣṇu appears on this earth in Avatāras whenever there is the decline of righteousness (Dharma) and the rise of unrighteousness (Adharma). He comes in different avatāras to protect the just and destroy the unjust; and to establish the order of righteousness in the world.

1.24.THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE ETERNAL THOU-VIṢṆU TO THE WORLD-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber's understanding of God is as the creator, preserver, revealer and redeemer of the world (Thous, beings, spiritual

---

104. Martin Buber, IT.p.168.

Rarest Archiver

beings, nature etc). Madhva's understanding is that Visnu (God) is the only Independent Being and the creatures, the Jagat, (world-prakrti-primordial matter) and Jīvas (souls) are dependent on Visnu. Visnu (God) is the Srsti (creator), Sthithi (preserver) and Pralaya (destroyer) of the world.

When we compare and analyze the doctrine of God's relationship to the world in Buber and Madhva, we find the existence, I-Thou relation oriented approach of Buber and the essence-centered approach of Madhva in each of their systems. Buber speaks of the problem of the creation of the world from the patrimony of the Jewish tradition of the Biblical faith. And his problem of creation and the concept of world find newness and meaning because of his application of the philosophy of I-Thou relationship of existence of the Eternal Thou to the world. That 'the Eternal Thou too has His I-Thou relationship with the world (creatures)' is one of the greatest original contributions of Buber in the history of the existential philosophy. He says, "Although we on earth never behold God without world but only the world in God, by beholding we eternally form God's form. It is the bond of the Absolute with the concrete and particular, not with the universal".[105] So, also in Madhva system, Visnu is the eternal Lord (Eternal Thou of Buber), of the eternal realities (Nityapadārthas or Anādinitya) namely, the time, space, Jīvas (souls) the primordial matter (prakrti) and the Vēdas (Scriptures). Further he maintains that Visnu's attributes, His manifestations can only be understood in relation to this world; and again Visnu is sarvanāmata, which

---

[105]. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., PP.354-355).

Rarest Archiver

means that He is the primary purport of every word including His attributes and manifestations. Viṣṇu is the cause of sṛṣti (origination), sthithi (sustenance) and saṁhāra (destruction) of the world.

Buber's implicit affirmation is that we find God in the reality of the world and therefore he says, "Men do not find God is they stay in the world. They do not find Him if they leave the world. He who goes out with his whole being to meet his Thou and carries to it all being that is in the world, finds Him who cannot be sought. If you explore the life of things and of conditioned being you come to the unfathomable, if you deny the life of things and of conditioned being you stand before nothingness, if you hallow this life you meet the living God".[106]

The explicit affirmation of Madhva is that this world is as real as Viṣṇu Himself and the reality of Viṣṇu and the world are intimately related to each other. The creation is real and it originated out of the causality of the primordial matter (prakṛti), which is subservient to the will of Viṣṇu. In his VTV, Madhva proves the reality of the world.[107] As a realist Madhva maintains that this world is neither an appearance nor māyā (illusion) as the māyāvādins maintained. This world originates from the real cause who is God and it is real; and Viṣṇu as the only God is capable of creating or producing this real world. He strongly affirmed that Viṣṇu is the efficient cause or causative cause (nimitta kāraṇa) of the universe and God is the mūla (root) of the same. God is the efficient cause

---

106. Martin Buber, IT, p.104; Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., P.355.
107. S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV.Nos. 328, 329, P.71.

Rarest Archiver

because He does not undergo any transformation just like a soul of a seed (bīja-jīva).

The real origin of the universe means sṛṣṭi of everything as a result of the evolution of prakṛti, and of the union of souls with bodies. All these happen because of Viṣṇu. God does not produce realties out of nothing. Existing realities acquire a new state of being, a change in dependence on the will of another (parādhīnaviśēṣāpti). Viṣṇu's causality is quite different from the action of ordinary causes. For example, Viṣṇu produces not merely water, but also the qualities of water and the very essence of these qualities. Viṣṇu's greatness is to be sought not so much in the fact that he produces substances, but in the fact that he produces, controls and hence enjoys every quality of every substance.[108]

According to Buber this world is not divine sport[109], where as according to Madhva Īśvara engages in the work of creating the world out of play (līla). But Madhva would say that Īśvara engages in creating the world not for the sake of gaining even a particle of profit.[110] The līla of Viṣṇu is rooted in his bliss. In Buber's understanding this world is divine destiny. There is divine meaning in the life of the world, of man, of human persons, of you and of me. Creation happens to us, burns itself into us, recasts us in burning- we tremble and are faint, we submit. We take part in creation, meet the creator, and reach out to Him, helpers and companions.[111] Hence Madhva also says that the world originated from the bliss of Viṣṇu and He alone

---

108. Bh.Gī Bh.VII.1.
109. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,P.368.
110. BSBh. II.i.33, 34.
111. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,P.368.

Rarest Archiver

is the reason for creation. No extrinsic motive determines Him to produce the world. What the Lord intends for the beings is the liberation of the good and damnation of the wicked.

According to Buber, the completion of creation and the response to revelation are the beginning of redemption. At the end of 'I and Thou' Buber affirmed an existential trust in history in which the very turning away from reality prepares the ground for a fuller and deeper redemption. In this redemption the alien, the exiled, the problematic, the "evil" is brought- unreduced and undenied, yet transformed and transmuted- into the renewed reality of relationship. Here creation, revelation, and redemption show themselves as three aspects of a single event.[112] Madhva's strong affirmation and teaching is similar to that of Buber as he maintains that Viṣṇu is the Supporter and Ruler of the World. Often Madhva uses in his writings a sort of formula that Viṣṇu is the source of the origin, support and government destruction (of the universe) and of ignorance, bondage and liberation (of souls). Viṣṇu is present, active in each being and faculty and at His command each being and even each faculty has a presiding deity. These deities too are instruments in the hands of the Lord for the support and government of the universe. Thus following the Vedāntic tradition Madhva says that Brahman (Viṣṇu) is the cause of the destruction of the manifest universe.

Buber sees this creation of the world in the light of Biblical faith. God who is the Eternal Thou is the creator, revealer and redeemer of this world-creation only in and through

---

[112]. Ibid.,PP.370-371.

Rarest Archiver

the I-Thou relationship. God can only be conceived in reference to His creation, which means His concrete relationship with all His creatures in the world (the world of human beings, material beings (nature) and the spiritual beings). The Eternal Thou is the Thou of all beings and He is the streaming life of the universe as speech and address, the source of all encounters and of real life. Everything is included in God and in turn God is not included in the totality of all. God comprises the universe, but not the universe.[113] Many had criticized Buber as the pantheist, but from the above statement of Buber, the criticism is rejected. When compared with the old traditions that existed during the time of Madhva, his thinking and contributions are original and in par with Buber and he is not a pantheist either.

But Buber does not use the terminology of destruction and annihilation (as Madhva uses) of the world as regards God's relation is concerned. In Madhva's understanding, Viṣṇu is the one who determines everything in the world and not any finite beings or the souls, which do not posses any absolute power in them.[114] In Buber's understanding, God does not seem to use any means or instruments in His work of creation of the world. Following the Biblical tradition and faith Buber would maintain that God created this world from the' not-yet- being. And creation is the free act of God that produces a reality out of not-yet- being. Not-yet- being is not to be thought of as a sort of chaos out of which God makes something. Not-yet-being does not mean out of something.[115]

---

113. Martin Buber, IT, p.122.
114. BSBh.II.2.1f.
115. Puthiadam, God, p.64.

Rarest Archiver

But in Madhva's understanding, Viṣṇu makes use of the means or instruments in his work of the creation of the world. But their power to be means or instruments come from God (BSBh.ii.39). The very determinations that such or such realities would be used as means of creation come from the will of Hari, the Lord (Svecchāniyama, AV.II.92). God uses for example, Prakṛti as the material cause of the world, just as a man though capable of walking on foot with no aid, uses a stick to lean on out of sport (Bh.G.Bh. IX.8). The 'Svatantrya' of the Lord is a key that Madhva uses to solve many of the problems as regards the creation of the world and the use of the instruments of sādhanas.[116] As regards the evolution of the universe Buber seem to differ from Madhva. According to him, the creation of the world and the dissolution of the same do not happen regularly and eternally but only once. The origination of the world and the destruction of the world take place only once and not eternally. Where as Madhva's understanding of the evolution of the world is different from Buber. He maintains that the primordial matter (prakṛti) is nitya (eternal) and also indestructible. The sṛṣṭi (creation of the world) and the prlaya (dissolution) regularly happen in recurring rotation and at the end of the world there is the sṛṣṭi or the world-creation of another. This creation and destruction or the end of the world goes on perpetually. After a long respite there happens the sṛṣṭi (world-creation). Hence in Madhva's understanding, the creation (evolution) and involution (reabsorption) of the universe happens countless times eternally. Just as Viṣṇu is the cause of the origination of the world and its supporting cause

---

116. Ibid.,PP.77-80.

Rarest Archiver

and ruler so is he the cause of its dissolution. What is meant by the last part of this formula is that beings, which have origination from, and are supported by Viṣṇu, do not disappear by themselves; the cause of their disappearance or reabsorption is Viṣṇu. As in the origination, support and ruling of the world, so in its dissolution too, Viṣṇu's causality (Kāraṇatvam) is at work, "He who was at the beginning of the world (of the manifest world) and from whom the world originated and who protects the world, from Him is the dissolution of the world. The dissolution of the world does not mean total annihilation, as it is the same case for all beings where dissolution means the reabsorption into the unmanifest state.[117] Buber says that this world is as real as God Himself and the reality of the world can only be testified in and through the I-Thou encounter with other human beings, nature, spiritual beings and God as the Eternal Thou.

Madhva specifically speaks about the reality of the world as 'Prapanca'. According to B.N.K. Sharma, starting from the foundations of sense-perception and Sākṣyānubhava and inference resting on them and interpreting the truths of Scripture in accord with the authority of Sākṣi-pramāṇa and Upajīvya-pramāṇa, Śrī Madhva arrives at a realistic metaphysics in which God, as Svatantra, occupies the central position, with matter and souls keeping their legitimate positions under Him. This reality as a whole is expressed in a system of fivefold distinction, which gives it its philosophical designation of "Prapanca". Madhva writes in his VTV, "That which consists of the great (pra) five

---

117. Tat.Dīp. P.88;Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, (Madurai: Dialogue Series, 1985), PP.213-241).

Rarest Archiver

kinds of differences (panca) is prapanca". "This valuable fivefold difference is "Prapanca". The word "Pra-panca" is derived from the substantive "Pancan" with the suffix "da" (a) signifying 'kind'. The prefix "pra" denotes 'excellence' or value. It is excellent in the sense that knowledge of this fivefold difference constitutes right knowledge that leads to Mokṣa. The Parama Śruti says: 'the universe consists of five differences. They are the difference between God and the individual self, that between God and insentient matter, that among individual selves, that between insentient matter and individual self and that among the material entities themselves. This is real and unoriginated". " This fivefold difference is the difference that exists as between Jīvas, Jadas (material principles) and Brahman on the one hand and mutually among Jīvas and Jadas themselves on the other".[118]

1.25.THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE ETERNAL THOU-VIṢṆU TO SOULS (JĪVAS)-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Both Buber and Madhva maintained that the relationship of the Eternal Thou -Brahman-Viṣṇu to I-Jīva (soul) is the relation of similarity and dependence. According to Buber God (Eternal Thou) creates man (I) in His own image and likeness. God has placed in man (I-soul) His own glimpse; therefore every soul is the glimpse of God. Madhva too strongly maintained that in every soul (Jīva) there is the reflection of God (Viṣṇu), which is called the reflection of the reflected (bimba-pratibimbabhava).

---

[118]. B.N.K.Sharma, Teaching, p.78; S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV, No.340, p.73; No.325, p.71.

Rarest Archiver

In Buber's explanations between God and soul (I-soul) the relationship is one of I-Thou, and every soul (Thous) is dependent on God in the supernatural and natural orders. The Bible mentions that God created man (Adam) in his own image.[119] Buber says, "God finally said to man who has come into being, "You".[120] Buber sees the conception of God's relationship to soul (I) not theologically but only existentially; and the redemption and revelation of God is to be seen only in relation to human experience.[121]

Buber is the existential and relational philosopher and explicitly admits that as God created man (I) in His own image and likeness, He has induced into the soul (man) the nature of 'inborn Thou' (God in relationship) and therefore he maintained that the relationship of the Eternal Thou is to be sought in and through every particular Thou (souls- others).[122] God's presence is to be felt in each Thou [123] and the Eternal Thou is to be met in each particular Thou.[124] (Buber also asserted that God cannot be fixed in any of the souls (I-man).

God (The Eternal Thou) created the soul (man) as an independent opposite and partner in I-Thou, and in return man is invited to respond and enter with the Eternal Thou through free I-Thou relationship. Thus God's copy or a prototype is the soul (man-I) but as a finite being, man (soul-I) is not a perfect

---

119. RSV Bible, Genesis, 1:27; 2:7, PP.1-2.
120. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.427.
121. Ibid.,p.424.
122. Martin Buber, IT.p.99.
123. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., p.340.
124. Ibid.,p.354.

Rarest Archiver

image of God. Hence Buber affirms that God is the Absolute Person who cannot be limited.[125]

Man (I-soul) cannot be understood as the perfect image of God though he has little resemblance to Him. From birth to death man (soul-I) stands over against God.[126] God's' fringe or vestige can be seen in every sphere in its own way and through each process of becoming, we look out toward the fringe of the Eternal Thou. The Eternal Thou is being felt in each Thou as a breath of Him. Though every sphere is compassed in God yet He is not compassed in them.[127] As God created man (soul) in his own divine image of I-Thou relationship, man reflects this I-Thou relationship and its realization. God is eternal, so also in Buber's understanding, the soul (I) of man is incorruptible eternal and this is said to be the clear sign of likeness of God. Hence God's image is in every particular Thou relationship.

Madhva's thoughts too are similar to Buber. According to him the relationship of Viṣnu to Jīva is one of similarity (sādṛsya), a dependence (adhīnatva) and independence (asvātantra). Because the Jīva possesses God's eternal attributes like existence (sat), consciousness (cit) and bliss (ānanda) it is little similar (alpasāmya) to Viṣnu. As Viṣnu is, the Jīvas (souls) are also eternal, uncreated, and indestructible and they belong to cetana dṛvya. Madhva affirms that this above-mentioned type of Jīvas' similarity to Viṣnu is only in kind and not in degree. God's existence, consciousness,

---

125. Martin Buber, IT, PP.169, 170.
126. Ibid., PP.130-132, 167.
127. Ibid., p.130.

Rarest Archiver

and bliss are infinite where as of Jīva it is finite. The Jīva pervades in space and time, and therefore, it is temporal. God (Viṣṇu) is Omnipresent and Omniscient whereas the knowledge of Jīva is limited and in bondage; and the ignorance (avidya) covers it, whereas. The Jīvas as regards their three aspects of satta (being, reality) pramiti (knowing) and pravṛtti (acting) are radically dependent on God.

Madhva conveys to us the idea of the two-fold relationship that exists between God and soul through the figure or example of pratibimba (reflection), Jīva is both similar and dependent on the reflected object (bimba) who is Viṣṇu; and as we have already seen, Madhva calls this relationship of Viṣṇu and Jīva as bimba-pratibimbabhāva- reflection of the reflected. As it is a fact that the reflection is different from the reflected, and the image is different from the person, likewise the Jīva is distinct from Viṣṇu and not identical with Him at all. However God is reflected, the soul is always weak. God (Viṣṇu) reflects in different degrees according to the nature (svarūpa) of Jīva. Many types of mirrors (convex, concave, dirty, clean or plain, tall or small etc) reflect the image of an object or man. Almost all the Jīvas reflect God, but according to their nature (svarūpa). The Jīvas like mukti-yōgyas when they reflect the image of God but more perfectly, the Tamoyōgya Jīvas reflect Him in a very weak and distorted type.

Therefore Buber and Madhva teach that the relationship between God (Eternal Thou -Viṣṇu) and soul (I-Jīva) is one of difference and similarity called bhēdābhēda. The Jīva has its own individuality and at the same time has relation to God. As Buber affirmed that every Thou (man-soul) is a partner with God

Rarest Archiver

for I-Thou relationship, Madhva expresses the relation between Visnu and Jiva in the images of King-Subject, Father -Son etc. Both admit that though God is the ground of all-antaryāmin (inner ruler) of each Jiva, He is not affected by the sufferings or evils of Jivas. Hence Buber said, "By its very nature God (the Eternal Thou) cannot become an IT".

1.26.CONTRIBUTIONS OF BUBER AND MADHVA IN THE CONCEPT OF GOD (ETERNAL THOU-VISNU):

The very important and profound contribution of Buber to the theology is to be seen in his person-existence-centered (I-Thou) philosophy as far as God (The Eternal Thou) is concerned. He offers a philosophy of I-Thou relationship and the existence, which embraces and refreshes the concept of God in the anthropomorphic sense. Further, in his philosophy of the I-Thou relationship, he calls God as the Absolute Thou who can be met and addressed as a Person; who creates, reveals, and redeems each Thou (I). Buber's conception of the real nature of God is a person and the Eternal Thou. The Eternal Thou God can be addressed and He is the ground of all I-Thou relationship of human beings. God meets man as a person. He takes on Himself the personality in order to communicate with us human beings. God is the Absolute Person and He is the active existential ground of all human persons in the world. Madhas' contribution to theology of God lies on his emphasis to the Absolute immutability (unchangeable, inalterability) of Visnu (God). His doctrine, 'though 'Jivas (souls) and matter are dependent on God (Visnu), yet they do not form the body of Visnu', the body of Visnu is His transcendent perfection and doctrine of independence of Visnu' are very important contribution of Madhva.

Rarest Archiver

CHAPTER–2

COMPARISON OF 'I' AND 'JĪVA'

2.0. INTRODUCTION: ON THE CONCEPT OF MAN:

In the anthropologies of Buber and Madhva, man is the concrete body-soul composite being, he is finite, spiritual being existing here and now in a body. Madhva understands that man exists here and there in a body or rather in bodies. Every soul caught up in the human situation has a gross body and a subtle body. The gross body is the eternal, sensible body which is born and which grows and dies. It is composed principally of earth, though the other elements, which are products of matter, are also to be found in it. This body has the external sense organs and the faculties of action. At each birth the soul becomes the possessor of a new gross body that accords perfectly with the state of its past karma (BSBSh.II.4.22, 23). The subtle body is the product of subtle matter. The subtle body has the inner, subtle faculties of knowledge and action. The five life-breaths and mind (manas), which give the first unity to all human actions form part of this body. This body, unlike the gross body, is united to the soul from eternity and will remain united to it till liberation is attained. It wanders with the soul in the course of its transmigratory existence (Kath.Up.Bh.p.12). Both these bodies are evolutes of matter and in themselves non-conscious, non-knowing substances. As matter is always subordinate to the spirit, so are both these bodies subordinate to the soul. The connection between the soul and matter is beginningless (BSBh.II.4.22, 23). There is in fact a

Rarest Archiver

third material entity, which is connected with the soul from beginningless time till the time of release, that is positive ignorance which is a part of the 'tamōguna' of matter that enchains the soul to the state of bondage. Like soul and matter, positive ignorance too is ultimately under the control of Viṣṇu and it is he who causes it to arise end to enchain the soul to the bodies. So the situation of man as man arises when a finite spiritual soul, gross body and fine body join together to form a single unit and when this whole composite is 'covered over' by ignorance.[1] While Madhva understands that the body of man is the evolute of matter, Buber maintains that the body is not the evolute of matter but God creates it. According to him, we are born as individual and not as persons; later we become persons. He makes a fundamental distinction between individual and person in contrast to the traditional theories. The I of man is two-fold in accordance to his twofold attitudes towards the world such as I-Thou (person- with others) and I-IT (individual-alone); and the I corresponding to the IT world is 'individual' (Eigenwesen) which means, '*its-own being*. The 'individuality' consists in experiencing, observing and objectifying others and on the other hand, the concept of 'person' consists in open sharing and in transcending himself with his whole being. 'Person' is one who participates and responds to reality in his openness. It detaches itself from everything else and is concerned.[2] Both Buber and Madhva hold that man exists in a

---

1. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.217, 218, 237.

2. Martin Buber, Hassidism and Modern Man',ed. Maurice Friedman, (New York: Horison Press,1958), P.159.

Rarest Archiver

milieu, time and space; and other human beings surround him. Man is subject to birth and death; and he is an agent and as well as enjoyer. He lives in the midst of a world where many and various inequalities and evils exist.

2.1.THE MEANING OF 'I' IN BUBER:

Buber says, "There is no 'I' taken in itself, but only the I of the primary word I-Thou and the I of the primary word I-It. when man says I he refers to one or other of these. The I to which he refers is present when he says I. Further, when he says Thou or IT, the I of one of the two primary words is present. The existence of I and the speaking of I are one and the same thing. When a primary word is spoken the speaker enters the word and takes his stand in it".[3] The explicit meaning of 'I' of man is the soul of man. Though Buber does not explicitly mention that the I of man as the soul of man, yet from the scattered thoughts of Buber, we can assume that by the 'I' of man Buber means the soul of man. Further, Buber seems to use 'spirit' for the soul that exists in man. Hence we find this concept in the following lines, "The spirit in its condition of highest differentiation is inclined to bend back on itself, i.e., the spirit to the extent of its individuation is inclined to forget, to deny that it does not exist in man (in I), but between man and what is not man...Then Being is psychologized, installed within the soul of man.[4] Buber also declared, 'What is elementally perceived is what takes place in one's own soul'.[5]

2.2.THE NATURE OF 'I' AND 'JĪVA'- BUBER AND MADHVA:

---

3. Martin Buber, IT, P.16.
4. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., p.350.
5. Ibid., p.351.

Rarest Archiver

In the anthropology of Buber, the essence of the 'I' (soul) of man is the relationship with the other Thous (beings) as in I-Thou or I-IT. The I is twofold in the world of relationship. What makes a man (I) complete is his relationship with the other beings (Thou). Thus Buber, says, "I become through my relation to the Thou; as I become I, I say Thou. All real living is meeting".[6] On the other hand in Madhva system, the very essence of soul (Jīva) and that animates the body of man, is life; and Jīva (soul) is said to be the principle of life in the living beings.

Following the Biblical story of Creation," Then the Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground (or formed a man (Heb-Adam) of dust from the ground (Heb-adamah)[7], and " When He finally says to man who has come into being, "You"[8], Buber, affirms that God created man out of earth who is material in nature. Thus he says, "we as mortals (of mortality) meet God in God's very giving and in his man's receiving of the concrete situation'; and "He (God) so to speak, became one in creating Man_".[9]

In Madhva's affirmation, all the souls (Jīvas) inclusive of plants, animals etc. are eternal, immortal and incorruptible and they survive their respective bodies. All Jīvas, though distinct from each other, yet are similar in nature, viz., similar in many characteristics. On the other hand, Buber maintains that there is vast difference of nature between man's

---

6. Martin Buber, IT, p.24-25.
7. RSV Bible, Genesis, 2:7, p.2
8. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., p.427.
9. The Great Ideas Today, 1967, Britannica Great Books, pp. 329, 338).

Rarest Archiver

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
MANASAGANGOTHRI
MYSORE

I (Soul), and the I's (Souls) of animals, matter and spiritual beings. As God creates man, his soul (I) is spiritual substance, which is united with his body.

Madhva, as a Hindu religious thinker, believes and maintains that the souls (Jīvas) are similar in nature to other souls as well and in their rebirth; they transmigrate from human bodies to plant or animal or vice versa. On the other hand Buber has not explicitly mentioned about the transmigration of the souls. In Buber's opinion, "that masterpiece of man's construction, is only the image of images, the most lofty of all images…".[10] The I is the agent of its action of I-Thou or I-IT relationship and it is I that enjoys the fruit of its Thou or IT relational actions. The I in the I-Thou relationship enjoys the good things of interpersonal relational life or else in the I-IT relationship, it suffers the ills of life of the non-interpersonal relationship and the augmentation of the I-IT world. Madhva has the same opinion that the soul is the jñāta (subject of knowledge), karta (an agent of action) and bhokta (an enjoyer of the fruit of action).

According to both the thinkers, the soul (I -Jīva) is different from the creator (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) and prakṛti (matter); and thus they strongly rejected any type or form of monism or pantheism [11]. Their stand is neither transcendent nor pantheist but again the coincidentia oppositorum".[12]

As Madhva holds that the Jīvas (souls) are eternally existing and they are dependent on Viṣṇu for their existence

---

10. Ibid.,p.339).
11. Martin Buber, IT, p.104.
12. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., p.355.

Rarest Archiver

(satta), Buber holds that the souls (I's) are created by God (The Eternal Thou), and once created they are eternally in existence. According to both of them, the soul (Jīva-I) pervades the whole body of man. But Madhva specifically says that the soul is atomic in size that dwells in the heart.

2.3.THE UNION OF BODY AND SOUL (I-JĪVA) IN MAN -BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber and Madhva hold that man is the concrete body-soul composite being, he is finite, spiritual being existing here and now in a body. According to Madhva, what confers on man of all the biological, intellectual operations, and all determinations as man is the Jīva (soul). According to both the thinkers, man is born when the Jiva -I come together, and man dies when the Jīva-I departs from his body. Buber, as an existential philosopher strongly maintains that when God created man both body and soul, He called him into the I-Thou relationship ... when He finally says to man who has come into being, "You" (Thou); and again Buber says, "The Eternal Thou is nearer to me than my I".[13]

In Buber's understanding, the I (soul) in composition of the body is placed in this world, which is not evil. The world is not evil as matter is not of evil.[15] The body of man and this material world are good but if man lets I-IT to have mastery over him, then it overruns him and robs him of the reality of his own I.[16] The creation is good that is created by God for the

---

13. Ibid.,pp. 427, 354-355.

15. Martin Buber, IT, p.66.
16. Ibid.,p.66.

Rarest Archiver

good of man.[17] Hence we find in Buber that the contact of the soul (I) with the body (matter) in this world is not a sign of bondage but when we are immersed in the I-IT relationship alone, we have the bondage of real person of the I-Thou relationship. As the matter is not evil the union of body and soul is not chastisement to the soul. Whereas Madhva believes that the body cannot participate in the ānanda of heaven (mokṣa) because it is the sign of bandha (bondage); and as regards the released souls he maintains that they have bodies that are formed out of *sattva* (pure matter) for the enjoyment of the pleasures of mokṣa.

Thus we can conclude holding that in Madhva's understanding the human being is essentially is the Jīva (soul); and for Buber the human being is the composite of body and soul (I) in I-Thou and I-IT relationship with other beings. While Madhva teaches that this karma-samāra (place of bondage because of past karma) is an opportunity for the soul to act according to its svarūpa (nature) and attain its final end that is mokṣa, Buber would maintain that the soul with salutary union with body has to attain its perception and more particularly the I-Thou relationship to which God has called.

2.4.THE PLURALITY AND HIERARCHY OF I-JĪVA (OF BEINGS)--BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber and Madhva accept the plurality and the hierarchy among souls (Jīvas) or among the beings, but in a different form. In the Buberian philosophy we have variety and gradation or the spheres of beings in the universe such as, 1. Human beings, 2. Spiritual beings (gods, angels) and 3. Beings in the nature (plants, animals, art, music etc). On the other hand

---

17. RSV Bible, Genesis. Chaps, 1&2.

Rarest Archiver

Madhva propagates the tri-partite classifications of the souls such as: 1. The Salvable or Sātvika Jīvas called Mukti-yōgya Jīvas, 2. Ever migrating or rajasika Jīvas called Nitya-saṁsārin Jīvas, 3. The Damnable or Tāmasika souls called Tamō-yōgya Jīvas. Buber speaks about man's fundamental nature of I-Thou relationship that is built up in three spheres such as: 1. Our life with nature in which the relation clings to the threshold of speech, 2. Our life with men, in which the relation takes on the form of speech, 3. Our life with the spiritual beings, where the relation, being without speech, yet begets it[18]. These three types of creatures too have their own nature of I in the I-Thou relationship and the I can relate itself with all spheres of life[20], such as with creatures like a house cat or a horse.[21] As regards the spirit Buber holds that on the level of experience, the world of the spirit should not be compared with the other two spheres.[22]

Our relationship with the spiritual realities is living one and without speech. Thus Buber says, "We hear no Thou and yet we feel addressed... though we cannot utter Thou with our lips".[23] In the relationship of man-with-man alone the true personal being emerges and this relationship can be best described as the relationship of love; and so, "Love is between I and Thou and Love is responsibility of an I for a Thou".[24] All these spheres

---

18. Martin Buber, IT, p.130; Cf.also, Martin Buber, I and Thou, Trans. Walter Kaufman, p.56-57.
20. Martin Buber, BMM, pp. 57.
21. Ibid., pp. 41-42.
22. Martin Buber, KM, pp. 52,54.
23. Martin Buber, IT, p.142.
24. Ibid.,pp.28-29.

Rarest Archiver

prepare the way for the relationship to the Eternal Thou, in each we are aware of a breath from the eternal Thou; in each Thou we address the eternal Thou.[25]

Madhva maintained that in the class of the Salvable or Sātvika or Mukti-Yōgyas, Laksmi, the consort of Viṣṇu is the Nitya-Mukta and then the devas or gods, sages or r̥ṣis, Fathers or pitr̥, Kings or pā, and men or nara are placed according to the order. The dēvas (gods), like angels, also belong to different schemes such as Vāyu, Brhama, Śēṣa etc. and there is hierarchical order among them. Under Viṣṇu's command and guidance dēvas, like angels, though dependent on Him are endowed with some extra-ordinary powers for performing some special functions in this world. In Buber's understanding the sphere of the I of I-IT relationship is gigantically swollen up and it steps in between God and the creatures; and it closes off from us the light of heaven that is the Eternal Thou (God)[26], and the sickness of the soul of I-IT are the sicknesses of relationship".[27]

In the Buberian doctrine there is the concept of the eternal hell (damnation) of the soul and we see this same concept to be parallel in the Madhva system. Lastly, there is no class of souls corresponding to Nityasaṁsārins in the Buberian system. This shows that Madhva's theory is developed from the doctrine of Trividha-Sraddha in the Gīta and its 'Śaṅkhyan'

---

25. Ibid.,p. 130.

26. Martin Buber, EG, pp.23, 129.
27. Maurice Freidman, Op.Cit., p.351.

Rarest Archiver

counterpart to be traced, ultimately, to its proper source in the nature of the Jīvas themselves.[28]

2.5.THE 'I'-'JĪVA' AND 'GOD' (ETERNAL THOU-VIṢṆU)-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber and Madhva maintain that between God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) and I-Jīva (soul) there is a relation of similarity and dependence (bhēdabhēda). Buber says, though man (I) is created in the image and likeness of God, yet God invites man to encounter Him in the I-Thou relationship alone. Every soul (I) is the glimpse through to Eternal Thou (God). Madhva also taught that Jīva (soul) is the pratibimba of Viṣṇu (bimba)- reflection of the reflected (bimba-pratibimbabhāva).

Buber quotes from Bible where it is mentioned, that God created man (Adam) in his image... and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living being[29], and God finally said to man who has come into being, "You".[30] Buber sees the conception of the creation of man not theologically but existentially.[31]

Every particular Thou (I-Soul) is a glimpse through to the eternal Thou and the inborn-Thou is realized in each relationship.[32] So he says, "So waiting I have won from thee the end God's presence in each element".[33] "The Eternal Thou is met in each particular Thou (Yet it cannot be fixed in any of them).[34] Man (I-soul) is like an image or a kind of copy or

---

28. B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya, p.303.
29. RSV Bible, Genesis, 1:27; 2:7, PP.1-2.
30. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., p.427.
31. Ibid.,p.424).
32. Martin Buber, IT.p.99.
33. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., p.340.
34. Ibid.,p.354.

Rarest Archiver

glimpse of its prototype of God. Finite man (I) cannot be perfect image of the Absolute and Infinite God. Therefore Buber says, "God is the Absolute Person, i.e., the Person who cannot be limited. No limitation can come upon Him as there Absolute Person, either from us or from our relations with one another.[35] Man stands over against God from birth to death.[36] Though all other creatures have glimpse or fringe or vestige of God but they can't be the perfect image of God and God is not compassed in them.[37]

The thoughts of Madhva too are similar to that of Buber who holds that the relation of Jīva and Viṣṇu is one of similarity (sādṛsya) and dependence (adhīnatva).The soul here, is said to be little similar (alpasāmya) to God (Viṣṇu) in the possession of His essential attributes like sat (existence), cit (consciousness) and Ānanda (bliss) only in kind and not in degree. The souls too are eternal, uncreated, and indestructible like Viṣṇu; and to cetana dṛavya they belong. The existence, consciousness, and bliss of God are infinite where as of soul it is finite. Because the soul pervades (pervasion) in space and time it is temporal; the knowledge of soul is limited and in bondage the ignorance covers it, whereas God (Viṣṇu) is Omnipresent and Omniscient. As regards their three aspects of satta (being, reality) pramiti (knowing) and pravṛtti (acting) the souls are radically dependent on Viṣṇu. Just like an image's reflection (pratibimba) is both similar and dependent on the

---

35. Martin Buber, IT, PP.169, 170.
36. Ibid.,PP.130-132, 167.
37. Ibid.,p.130.

Rarest Archiver

reflected object (bimba), so also the soul is similar to and dependent on Viṣṇu that is called as bimba-pratibimbabhāva-reflection of the reflected. Just like the reflection is different from the reflected, and the image is different from the person, likewise the soul is distinct from Viṣṇu and not identical with Him. Viṣṇu reflects in different degrees according to the nature (svarūpa) of the soul. The muki-yōgyas, while they reflect the image of God more perfectly, the Tamōyōgya souls reflect Him in a very weak and distorted way. Madhva expresses the relation between Viṣṇu and soul in the images of King-Subject, Father -Son etc. whereas for Buber, God and man are partners in relationship. According to both, though God is the ground of all-antaryāmin (inner ruler) of each soul, He is not affected by the sufferings or evils of them. So, Buber says, "by its very nature the Eternal Thou cannot become an IT".

2.6.THE PROBLEM OF EVIL--BUBER AND MADHVA:

The systems of Buber and Madhva accept and deal with the reality of the problem of evil in the world; but they differ in their concept of the evil. Buber defines evil as the augmentation of the IT attitude in the world and the sicknesses of the soul are sicknesses of relationship (of I-Thou).[38] As experience, the world belongs to the primary word I-IT.[39] IT is objective attitude towards a person, looking at him as a part of the world.[40] Buber held that this world is not evil so he says, "and the primary word I-IT is not evil as matter is not of

---

38. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., p.351.
39. Martin Buber, IT, p.18.
40. Michael Wyschogrod, Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Vol.1&2, p.410.

Rarest Archiver

evil"[41] He maintains that if man lets it (matter) have mastery, then the continually growing world of IT (matter) overruns him and robs him of reality of his own I till the incubus hovers him. ...[42] There is less and less attention paid to man as person today.[43] Horwitz also sees in the present century 'the outcry of a generation suffocated by machines, institutions, sciences and information- a generation seeking real life'.[44] Buber speaks of the 'Eclipse of God' as it is indeed the character of the historic hour through which the world is passing. An eclipse of the Sun is something that occurs between the sun and our eyes, not in the sun itself.[45]

According to Madhva too, some souls (for example tamōyōgyas) are essentially evil by nature. Buber's notion is that life is an endless transition from Thou to IT and back to the 'Thou.' Buber says, "The IT is necessary material for the necessary becoming of the Thou, and unless it is brought again and again into the Thou, there can be no Thou.[46] According to Madhva too, evil positively exists in the souls as in Buber's system.

2.7.CAUSE OF EVIL-- BUBER AND MADHVA:

Both Buber and Madhva do keep the Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu beyond all evil in the world; and no evil can come from Him, because He is all perfect and Goodness Himself. Buber holds that God never willed or wills any evil to man directly in the world because He

---

41. Martin Buber, IT, p.66.
42. Ibid.,p.60.
43. Francis J.Lescoe, Existentialism, p.165.
44. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.423.
45. The Great Ideas Today, 1967, Britannica Great Books,p.323.
46. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,P.423.

Rarest Archiver

created everything good.[47] The I-IT attitude is causing the evil and it occurs between God and man.[48] The degenerated man of I-IT has made himself the master of the house and driven out the man of I-Thou into catacombs. This is the cause of evil that has come between God and man.[49] Thus Holderlin said, "But alas! Our generation walks in night, dwells as in Hades, without the divine.[50] The Eternal Thou is not cause of evil, but the we of I-IT, because, it is we who are not always there and God never ceases to be Thou for us; and He is nearer to me than my I.[51] It is man (Adam) who sinned against God[52] and gets lost and becomes unworthy of God; and hides from His presence. So there is inequality in the world.[53]

Further Buber and Madhva maintain that when the finite beings (creatures) in the universe loose their degree of perfection, the consequence is the deficiency in some good ('Thou' in Buber; good in Madhva) which is nothing but evil. With the presence of the corruptible creatures (beings) necessarily and invariably it implies the presence of physical or natural evil in the world. Only accidentally and not purposefully, God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) can be the cause of the evil in the world. So, Buber holds that there is the incomprehensible and tremendous hiddenness from the side of God who chooses this type of hiddennes that can be cited with the

---

47. RSV Bible, Genesis, 1.
48. Martin Buber, EG, PP.23, 129; Great Ideas Today, 1967, Britannica Great Books, p.323).
49. Ibid.,p.129.
50. Great Ideas Today, 1967, Britannica, Great Books, p.322.
51. Martin Buber, IT, p.104.
52. RSV Bible, Genesis: 3.
53. Puthiadam, Visnu the Ever Free, p.257.

Rarest Archiver

example of a person called Job in the Old Testament of the Bible.[54] If, accidentally God is the cause of evil, it is because He wants to purify and refine man towards his relationship of I-Thou. So, God permits the I-IT (material-physical and moral evil) as necessary attitude towards the perfect I-Thou relationship. Thus man (of I-IT) is the direct cause of evil in the world.

In Madhva, the basis for all natural or moral evils is in the nature-difference and in the three-fold classification of souls (svarūpa-tāratamya and Jīva-Traividhyam) themselves. Viṣnu, by purpose or accident, or directly or indirectly, can never be the cause of moral or natural evil in the universe. Few of the souls especially the damnable (Tamōyōgyas) are basically evil souls and these evil souls will evil as evil in the world. Prof. B.N.K. Sharma opines that Madhva solves the problem of evil by only rational way by fixing the responsibility for goodness or evil upon the moral freedom born of diversity of nature of the souls who are themselves eternal and uncreated in time".[55] If it is not done, it would be the doom of theism. No charge of partiality and cruelty can therefore be brought against God. The presence of good and evil is thus entirely traceable to the Jīvas in the light of the theory of Svarūpa-tāratamya and the threefold grouping of Jīvas.[56]

---

54. Martin Buber, EG, PP.37, 60.

55. B.N.K. Sharma, Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya, p.290.

56. Swami Tapasyānanda, Śrī Madhvācārya, His Life, Religion & Philosophy, (Madras: Śrī Rāmakrishna Math), PP.72-73.

Rarest Archiver

2.8.THE 'I'-JĪVA (MAN) AND THE WORLD--BUBER AND MADHVA

In Buber's opinion, this world is not a divine (Madhva had maintained that the creation is the out c Viṣṇu's play-līla) but a divine destiny. There is meaning in the life of the world, of man (I), of human p (thous), of you and me. Creation happens to us, burns into us, recasts us in burning- we tremble and are fai submit. We take part in creation; meet the Creator rea to Him, helpers, and companions. Man (I) is which to stand and that he is able to go out to meet God and world from that ground. He can go forth to meet the Cr who addresses him in every aspect of his creation.[57] His are, 'the distance and relation of self (I) and world a independent yet interacting realities: "Certainly the "dwells" in me as an image, just as I dwell in it as a The relationship of the soul and world is the 'between' faithful faith is important.[59] We encounter God in the w One should not renounce the world but to establish it up proper ground (God).[61] God is the mystery of the self-e that is "closer to me than my own I through this world. should not shun or avoid this world as something basicall or undesirable. Neither should he try to die to this wo matter as the Neoplatonic man was counseled to do, in or

---

57. Maurice Friedman , Op.Cit.,PP.367-369).
59. Ibid.,PP.346-353.
60. Ibid.,PP.354-355.
61. Martin Buber, IT, p.122.
62. Ibid.,p.104.

Rarest Archiver

rise above evil and return to the God. Man is capable of living a life of holiness, purity and deep spiritual joy in the service of God and his fellow man in the world.[63] Man as man (I) is possible because he exists in the world. Man alone has a world and though conditioned by the world, he is able to condition his world and transcend the necessities of his life. Man is called to establish the world of I-Thou relationship because the I-Thou establishes the world of relation.[64]

As a realist and pluralist philosopher and theologian, Madhva teaches (although he maintains that there are seven worlds), the world (our world) is real as Viṣṇu (Brahman) Himself is who creates, guides, helps and controls it in which we live, have our being, and live our lives in various ways. Viṣṇu peceives the world and the jīvas as real and factual realities.[65] Besides many sacred texts, the Bhagavadgīta also clearly holds the view that jagat (world) is satya or real. *'Prakrtim puruṣam chaiva viddhi anādi ubhau api, etc. statements clearly affirm jagatsatyatva*-the reality of the world. *Jagat* consists of *prkṛti, mahat* etc. twenty-four categories. It is the constituents of *sattva, rajas* and *tamas*. It provides the physical apparatus of *śarīra, antaḥkaraṇa* etc. to *jīva* and involves him in the experiences of pleasure that can be used or abused by *jīvas* depending upon their nature i.e., *sāttvika, rājasa* etc. The *jagat* is entirely under the control of God in respect of its essential nature and functions.[66] The reality of

---

63. Francis J.Lescoe, Existentialism, p.41.
64. Martin Buber, IT, p.18.

65. S.S. Rāghavacār, VTV.Nos.370-371.
66. K.T. Pandurangi, Essentials of Bhagavadgīta, (1994), p.35.

Rarest Archiver

the world, the reality of the Jīva and the reality of Viṣṇu are intimately related to each other. The denial of the reality of the world is a blasphemy against the Absolute cause (Viṣṇu) of all. "Only those who are ignorant of the supreme power of Viṣṇu say that the world is unreal.[67] All beings exist in the world.

Man is concrete Body-Soul composite being and a finite, spiritual being exists in a milieu; he exists in a world, which is in time and space. In Madhva, this material world is the field (sādhanabhūmi) that viṣṇu provides for the spiritual evolution of the jīvas or the liberation of jīvas. Thus this world is not illusory and viṣṇu has not possibly given to souls this type of illusory environment for their liberation. Creation has purpose for man and for God. Therefore Madhva uses the terminology viz., 'na prayōjanaya sṛṣṭiḥ'[68] Madhva accepts that man lives in the midst of a world where inequalities and the problem of evil exist. The world is not evil and the world is real and so God (Viṣṇu) has created this real world as the ground for ones self-realization and salvation (mukti).

2.9.THE EXISTENCE OF I-JĪVA (MAN) IN THE UNIVERSE:

Existentially and ontologically, i.e., from the viewpoint of the inner structure of man (I) (inborn Thou), Buber admits a twofold distinction among men in the world and they are: 1. Men (I's- Thous) of I-Thou relationship and 2. Men (I's-Thous) of I-IT relationship. Buber seems to name the man (I or Thou) of I-IT as, "*demonic Thou*".[69] Madhva, too ontologically (according to the inner structure of man-Jiva), accepts threefold category of

---

67. S.S.Rāghavachār,VTV.No.260.p.56.

68. BSBh.II.1.33.

69. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., PP.345-346.

Rarest Archiver

men (nara)[70], such as: 1. Those that are fit for liberation (muktiyōgyas - those who have already attained liberation and those who will attain it). 2. Those who are destined to wander forever in this transmigratory existence, and finally 3. Those destined to go to hell (cf. Tattvasamkhyāna). The Jīvas eternally liberated are, e.g. Laksmi, those fit for liberation are: gods (dēvas), sages (r̥̄sis), the fathers (pitr̥), Kings (pā) and men (nara), and those that are not fit for liberation are (tamōyōgyas).[71] Vāyu, the god of cosmic power, is said to be the breath or wind, which penetrates every element of Jīva and the universe.[72] The terminology of the 'breath' of God (Ruah Yahweh in Hebrew- The breath of God Yahweh) seems to be similar to Madhva's concept of god Vāyu [73] as he is the breath or wind of God (Viṣṇu). Man lives in the spirit when he is able to respond to his Thou with his whole being in the world. In connection to the above explanations of the categories of souls (I's) Buber names two types of men as Loyal selves of covenant, fidelity [74] and the Disloyal or False Selves -demoniac Thous.[75] In Madhva's opinion, each Jīva in its own class has an essential, incommunicable nature (svarūpa) of its own.[76] According to one's own capacity (Yōgyata) and of svarūpa (nature) each Jīva occupies a definite position and accomplishes certain functions

---

70. Cf. Tattvasaṁkhyāna.
71. Ch.Up.Bh.VII.25-26; cf. Also Tattvasamkhyana.
72. Br.A.Up.Bh. III.5, 9.

73. RSV. Bible, Genesis, 2:7.
74. Francis J.Lescoe, Existentialism, p.161.
75. Michael Wyschogrod, Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Vol.1&2, p.410.
76. BSBh.II.3.51; Tat.Di.p.271; Tat.Pr.on BSBh.3.51)-

Rarest Archiver

in the world.[77] In Buber's opinion each soul (I) has the capacity to reach God through the I-Thou relationship of the inborn Thou.

2.10.I-JĪVA (MAN) AND SOCIETY-BUBER AND MADHVA:

The Hindu thought took for granted about the concept of caste, and caste forms as the primary unit of society. [78] What each one has to practice is the 'caste ethics. According to this view of the caste, Madhva accepts the existence of family and family duties.[79] Śūdras and women are excluded from the source of salvific knowledge, viz., the Vēdas. The only way open to them to acquire religious knowledge is the Mahābhārata, the fifth Vēda;[80] only the Brahmins may study the whole Vēda etc. The past karma is given as the reason why one is born as a woman or as a member of such or such a caste.[81] In the system of Buber the caste and the caste that forms the social unit is absent.

Influenced by the Bhakti movement, Madhva received the idea of the 'Bhakta Saṅgha' (group of devotees) and maintains that a bhakta must seek the company of the devotees.[82] The yogin and the devotees of Viṣṇu have the duty to teach others (BSBh.IV.1.3). To be liberated one must also serve the devotees of Viṣṇu. In his work on philosophical discussion (Kathālakṣaṇa) Madhva says that one can reach the subtle truth concerning Viṣṇu more easily by means of group discussions. This shows that

---

77. Mbh.T.N. XXII.184-88.
78. Cf. SB.10, 4.1.9; Bh.Gī.IV.13-18; Madhva's view on the origin of caste -Bh.Gī.IV.13); Pr.Dī. on Bh.Gī.IV.13.
79. Bh.Gī.II.18, 31.
80. Bh.Gī.Bh.II.18, 31, VI
81. Bh.Gī.IX.32.
82. Glasenapp, Madhvas Philosophy of the Viṣṇu Faith, p.92-93.

Rarest Archiver

groups can be of help to man in his effort to reach liberation.[83]

According to Madhva, since Viṣṇu dwells in all beings one must have a universal, benevolent attitude to all in requirement of one's āśrama dharma (Cf. Bh.Gī.Bh.VI.32; VI.30). But caste with its functional and other differences exists in this world and it is from the Lord.[84]

2.11.'I-JĪVA' (MAN) IN THE UNIVERSE-BUBER AND MADHVA:

In Madhvism, the whole universe is made up of a hierarchy of real and ordered spiritual and material beings. Each finite spirit with its svarūpa-yōyata (nature-fitness) is the reflection of one or other aspect of the Supreme Being. Lord has willed the hierarchy and harmony of Jīvas in the universe; and these individual realities are interrelated. Similarity and generality (sādṛśya and sāmānya) are true of the Jīvas. The Jīvas fit for salvation are in this universe so that they might with the help of Viṣṇu's grace work out their final destiny.[85] According to the Buberian system, this whole universe is made up of a hierarchy of real (Thous or I-Thou and I-IT) and ordered spiritual (God, gods, angels) and material (animate and inanimate beings in the nature) beings. Each Thou (I) as the image of God and finite beings with their nature of inborn Thou are the reflections (glimpses) of the one or the other aspect of the Eternal Thou in the universe. Man is called to transform this world into the world of I-Thou.

---

83. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.252-256.

84. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.256-257.

85. Ibid., PP.262-264.

Rarest Archiver

2.12.'I-JĪVA'S' (MAN'S) LAST DESTINY-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Both Buber and Madhva maintain that God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) is the ultimate end for the human life. Because of his sinful acts (pāpa) and relations (I-IT) that he does under the influence of Kama (desire), krōdha (anger), man deviates from his ultimate end that is God. The perfect happiness (the glorious vision of God) for man consists only in and through the I-Thou relationship. Whereas Madhva considers that man (Jīva) cannot attain his perfect happiness from any creatures (beings) in this world but only Viṣṇu, through His prasāda (grace) can bestow on him the perfect happiness; and this perfect happiness or bliss (ānanda) consists in the glorious vision of Viṣṇu.

2.13.THE SOURCE AND NATURE OF I-JĪVA'S BONDAGE (BANDHA)--BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber and Madhva admit that the I-Jīva (soul) is in the state of bondage in this world. Buber as a practical, realist, and personalistic philosopher maintains that every Thou (I) in this world is doomed (destined) by its nature to become a thing (IT) or at least to enter into thinghood again and again.[86] There happens a gradual expansion of the I-IT world in the development of human race (I) from the primitive man to the technological man of today. The man of I-IT is the Lord of the hour.[87]; and "that is the melancholy of man and his greatness" today.[88] "The development of the ability to experience and use comes about mostly through the decrease of man's power to enter

---

86. Martin Buber, 'I and Thou', Tr.Walter Kaufman, PP.73-74.
87. Martin Buber, EG, p.129.
88. Martin Buber, IT, p.58.

Rarest Archiver

into relationship…."[89]. The progressive tendency of "Vital disassociation" is the "palpable manifestation of modern man's lack of relationship"[90] and it is the sickness of the people of our time. Further the I-IT world "steps in between and shuts off from us the light of heaven"[91] Though I-IT is necessary without which no earthly persistence of human existence is possible, but its hubris that over-strides all measures is the power of demonic Thou we have reared by ourselves".[92] There is the source of pain and despair in modern man in the world of IT; and on the divine side there is the Eclipse or the veiling of the divine countenance.[93]

According to Madhva, the immediate cause for the bondage of Jīva is its avidya (svabhāvajñāna) or ajñāna (ignorance).[94] The ignorance or avidya is in the Jiva itself and not in Visnu; but in the final analysis of Dvaita Vedānta, it is Viṣṇu Himself who is responsible for the avidya (ignorance) of Jīva that results in the bondage of Jīva. The Jīva's contact with the dēha (body) that constitutes the bondage (bandha) is beginningless; and as well as the avidya (ignorance), its effects, the bondage (bandha) is also beginningless time.

2.14.THE SOURCE AND NATURE OF LIBERATION OF I-JĪVA-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber holds that the ultimate source of liberation or redemption (salvation) of the soul (I) is an event of the

---

89. Ibid.,p.58.
90. Ibid.,p.137.
91. Martin Buber, EG, p.129.
92. Martin Buber, Replies to my Critics", in Schilpp, PMB.p.716.
93. Martin Buber, EG, PP.22-23, 66-68.
94. Swami Tapasyananda, Op.Cit., p.77.

Rarest Archiver

'Between' of man and man [95] as the event of turning, turning back to God- in joy, in thanksgiving, in wonder, but also in despair, in crisis, in security [96], yet it is ultimately through the grace of God (Eternal Thou) and of genuine I-Thou relationship that man can be liberated or redeemed.

On the other hand Madhva maintains that Viṣṇu is the ultimate source of mukti or liberation of Jīva. Liberation of Jīva implies the knowledge-jñāna and liberation (mukti-redemption); through knowledge the Jīva is freed from its bondage to the body (matter). It is Viṣṇu alone who gives both knowledge (jñāna) and mukti (liberation-redemption) to Jīva. The soul (I-Jīva) may be required of sādhanas (means) in the way of its liberation, but all these means (sādhanas are just a help that prepare I-Jīva for the grace (prasāda) of God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu). When the Lord gives prasāda (anugraha) to the Jīva, the veil of ignorance is removed and thereby the Jīva is free from its union to matter (body). The freedom or the release of Jīva though is possible through the Brahmasakṣātkāra (knowledge of Viṣṇu), yet is all made possible only through the gratuitous gift His grace.

2.15.THE NATURE OF LIBERATION-REDEMPTION OF I-JĪVA--BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber uses the terminology of redemption instead of liberation and according to him the salvation of man (I) consists in the I-Thou relation of the 'between' in community of persons (beings). Whereas Madhva holds that salvation (mukti)

---

95. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.370.

96. Ibid.,pp.370, 37.

Rarest Archiver

consists in the Jiva's intimate union with Viṣṇu. Jīva attains the vision of Him and enjoys the ānanda (bliss) of Him in heaven after its death. Buber says, "in this redemption (I-Thou), the alien, the exiled, the problematic, the 'evil' are brought-unreduced and undenied, yet transformed and transmuted-into the renewed reality of relationship.[97]

On the other hand by liberation (mukti) Madhva understands that is the Jīva's freedom from the material body (matter) to which it is bound. In its liberation the Jīva attains its real and original svarūpa (nature) in all its fullness and purity; and ultimately it attains its immediate vision of Viṣṇu and with its union with Him. As the Jīva is the reflection (pratibimba) of Viṣṇu, it can enjoy the enjoyments of Him. Both Buber and Madhva similarly admit that God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) has created this world to give an opportunity to man (I-Jīva) to attain liberation (mukti) or redemption.

2.16.THE MEANS OF LIBERATION-REDEMPTION OF I-JĪVA- BUBER AND MADHVA:

For Buber, the I-Thou genuine and reciprocal relationship is the sādhana or means of one's salvation. Where as Madhva maintains that the means (sādhnas) or mukti (salvation) do not bring to Jīva immediate and direct liberation but they only predispose it for the prasāda (grace) of Viṣṇu and thereby attain its salvation (liberation). In Buber's affirmation, the means of redemption (salvation) is, 'to exit with others and in communion with others. The sphere of the 'between' is the ontological ground of existence and the locus of interhuman as

---

97. Ibid.,p.371.

Rarest Archiver

necessary means for redemption. Thus Buber says, "As I become I, I say Thou."[99] The self becomes I, in saying Thou[100] and there should be responsible response to every address of Thou [101] for the salvation of man. Where as according to Madhva, the grace (prasāda) of Viṣṇu brings the direct experience (aparokṣa-jñāna) of Him to the Jīva. The other sādhanas or means of liberation are: Vairāgya (non-attachment), Karma -mārga or Karmayōgya (The way of works), Jñāna-mārga (the way of knowledge), and Bhakti-mārga (the way of Devotion) etc. The non-attachment (vairāgya) and the works with niṣkāma karma (karma-mārga- according to one's varṇa āśrama) are means for one's salvation.[102] In the concept of the way of knowledge (Jñāna-mārga), the Jīva realizes that Viṣṇu alone as the only independent reality through four steps, namely; Hearing (śravaṇa), reflection (manana), Contemplation (meditation-nididhyāsana- fixing of one's whole mind upon the truths heard and reflected upon) and the Upāsana which is according to Madhva, takes the form of either remembrance (smṛti) or of meditation (dhyāna).[103] 'Upāsana' (Pratikōpasāna- worship of the images of Viṣṇu who is merely present in the image and Bimbōpāsana- to realize that Jīva is the reflection (pratibimba) of God), in its ordinary sense means, service or religious worship; but idol worship is not the means of one's salvation.[105] Buber as a Jew accepts to honour the teacher or gurus of Hassidism or Zaddik etc. The I-Thou genuine

---

99. Martin Buber, IT, PP.24, 25.
100. Ibid.,p.121.
101. Ibid.,PP.57-59.
102. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, p.281.
103. BSBh, III, 3.43;Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.289, 290.
105. B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy of Madhvācārya, p.412.

Rarest Archiver

and reciprocal relationship is the mystical union or the foretaste of moksa (heaven).

2.17.LIFE OF I-JĪVA BEYOND DEATH- ESCHATOLOGY--BUBER AND MADHVA:

In Buber opinion, though the concept of heaven or hell is not clear, yet the final destiny of soul (I), according to him exists only in and through the I-Thou relationship. Man can realize his heaven (I-Thou) or hell (I-IT) here in this world itself. Heaven or hell is one's state of relationship with the other beings that is a transcendental norm, or an eschatological promise for man. Madhva believes that heaven or hell is the final destiny of Jīva after death. He affirms that the unreleased Jīvas remain in the world (of saṁsāra). The heaven or hell is a state and a place for Jīvas. In the thought of Madhva there is the concept of ānanda (bliss) of heaven and the Eternal punishment in hell. The Jīvas preserve their individuality and identity in heaven and the ānanda of heaven is real and positive. There is the gradation in the ānanda of heaven for the Jīvas.

2.18.THE JOURNEY OF THE I-JĪVA AFTER DEATH-BUBER AND MADHVA:

In Buber's system, redemption is possible even here in the very existence of each Thou in the relationship of I-Thou. Thus he says that the redemption of man (I) means the bringing of ever-new layers of the world of IT into the immediacy of the Thou. The partnership of man with God in creation, the rising of a human cosmos built out of genuine community and a redemptive life of relationship, the shining, streaming constancy that the Thou may win in the IT, are all hints of redemption and the

Rarest Archiver

journey of the soul (man).[106] But on the other hand, according to Madhva, liberation of Jīva is possible only after its death (physical body on the exhaustion of prārabdha-karma or that quantum of karma that has brought the present body into existence.[107] At the fall of linga-śarīra (gross body or physical body), the aparōkṣa-jñāni rises from the linga-śarīra to the dēvalōka (world of gods); and at this stage, he waits till the entire universe (cosmos) is to be dissolved by Viṣṇu. At the time of dissolution the subtle body is also destroyed; herein lies the proper release of Jīva and then follows the state of the enjoyment of never ending mokṣa (bliss) of Jīva. Further Madhva affirms that the Nitya-saṁsārins and those Jīvas, whose karmas are not exhausted, undergo transmigration (birth-rebirth) in the world, where as the tamōyōgya Jīvas are damned into hell of eternity. Thus Madhva agrees that the liberation or the punishment (condemnation) of Jīva take place only after death.

Further Madhva maintains as mentioned above, that the Jīva has to wait for the final release till the entire universe is dissolved and during the dissolution of this universe the linga-śarīra (subtle body) will be destroyed which is the last sign of bondage (bandha) to the Jīva. Another sṛṣṭi (creation) altogether, i.e., sṛṣṭi, sthithi, pralaya cycle are the new creations according to Madhva.

2.19.THE PREDESTINATION OF I-JĪVA-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber does not seem to subscribe to the view that I's (souls) are predestined to heaven or hell by the Eternal Thou

---

106. Maurice Friedman, Martin Buber's Life and Work, p.370.

107. Swami Tapasyānanda, Op. Cit., p.87.

Rarest Archiver

(God). Likewise Madhva too does not subscribe to the view of the predestination of Jīvas into heaven or hell by Viṣṇu. According to Buber every Thou (I) determines its own destiny of I-Thou or I-IT relationship with other beings (Thous). It is clear that Madhva teaches in a very explicit terms that souls (Jīvas) determine their own destiny. Thus Madhva divides the Jīvas into different and irreducible classes. Some are fit to reach release and others are unfit for release. Thus this theory in itself does not imply the idea of theological predestination.[108]

Buber holds that though Thous (I) are dependent on Eternal Thou for their creation, preservation, and redemption, yet He gives freedom of will to all Thous (souls). The destiny of soul to the I-IT is not destined by God but each particular Thou itself has self-determined to be so. According to Madhva system the Jīvas depend on God (Viṣṇu) for their Svarūpa (nature), pravṛtti, pramiti, sṛṣti (creation), Sthithi and pralaya (dissolution) etc. In Madhva the time is cyclic, the cycle of sṛṣti, sthithi and pralaya goes on and on with many births, lives and deaths (rebirth or transmigration) till their karma is exhausted. Meanwhile, the liberated souls will merit mokṣa, the evil will be condemned to tamas (hell), and others will wander in saṁsāra in accordance to their svarūpa.[109]

---

[108]. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, p.339.

[109]. Dominic Charles Vas, God, World and Soul, Op.Cit., PP.416-417.

Rarest Archiver

CHAPTER–3

COMPARISON OF 'IT' AND 'JAGAT'

3.1.CONCEPTION OF THE WORLD-BUBER AND MADHVA:

In Buber's Biblical and Jewish opinion God is the Creator,[1] Redeemer and preserver of this real world (creation); and He, has His I-Thou relation to this world. Similarly Madhva too teaches that the eternal Brahman (God-Viṣṇu) is the eternal Lord of the eternal realities, viz., the world (universe- Prakṛti-the primordial matter) the Jīvas (Souls), space and time etc. Thus the manifestations and the attributes of God (Viṣṇu) and He, as the primary purport of every word (Viṣṇu's Sarvanāmata) should only be understood in relation to this world. Buber as a realist metaphysician holds that the world and men though independent, yet ultimately they are dependent on God for their own complete realization. In his system of pancabhēda (fivefold distinction), Madhva expresses the reality of the world as a whole that gives it its philosophical designation of "Prapanca". He says, "That which consists of the great (pra) five kinds of differences (panca) is prapanca.[2]

The prapanca is excellent in the sense that knowledge of this fivefold difference constitutes right knowledge that leads one to salvation (Mokṣa). "The universe consists of five differences such as difference between God and individual self, between God and insentient matter, that between individual selves, that between insentient matter and individual self and

---

1. RSV Bible, Genesis, Ch.I:1
2. S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV.No.325, p.71.

Rarest Archiver

that among the material entities themselves. This is real and unoriginated.[3] This fivefold difference is the difference that exists between God, Jīvas (Souls) and the world (Jadas-material principles)....[4], the eternal relation and difference between these entities is the pra-panca-the uniquely five. In Madhva's understanding the world (Prakṛti- primordial Matter) is different from, and coeval with Viṣṇu (God-Brahman) and in Buber's thought, the world is to be found as existing in I-Thou relationship with the Eternal Thou (God). But nonetheless the world subsists absolutely by God's will, and functions by that will in every detail according to Madhva[5]; and in Buber's understanding too the world as the creation of God, functions through His will (will of I-Thou relationship).

3.2.THE REALITY OF THE WOLD EXPERIENCE-BUBER AND MADHVA:

With the words, 'God speaks and the world is created'[6] Buber sees the Bible as the old record of the I-Thou experience of Israelites with their God YAHWEH in the world which is said to be the witness of a thousand-year-old I-Thou relational experience of God and Israel.[7] The essence of the Biblical religion is one of the realities for the world experience in the world.[8] The human life was a continuous I-Thou relationship between the above and the below, between heaven and earth.[9] The Ten Commandments of the Bible too are witness of God's I-Thou

---

3. Ibid., VTV.No.340, p.73.
4. B.N.K.Sharma, Teachings in His own words, p.78.
5. Swami Tapasyānanda, Op.Cit.,p. 56
6. RSV, Bible, Genesis: I: 1-24, p.1.
7. Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith, p.54.
8. Martin Buber, The Origin and Meaning of Hassidism, p.91, 92.
9. Martin Buber, On Judaism, PP.214, 215).

Rarest Archiver

relations in the world.[10] As God speaks to Moses as: "I am what I am"[11], in the book of the Exodus of the Bible, Buber newly interprets it as 'I shall be there as there I shall be" (in the world).[12] God is constantly present and appears in the history of humanity in the world.[13] The appointed work of man and his responsibility in the world is the I-Thou relationship.[14] God is never absent from the creation (world).[15] God's presence becomes possible in the world.[16] All the objects and creatures, and communitarian people encounter God in the world. God addresses all beings in the events of great and small in the world.[17]

As there are texts in the Bible[18] that describe the creation and origination of the world, in like manner Madhva, quotes from Upanishadic texts to describe the creation, origination and evolution of the world. The Upaniṣads uphold "a real world, real souls and real God" and they mention that Brahman is the creator, preserver, regulator, and controller of this real world creation, world of matter and souls. Madhva writes, "Therefore, nowhere in the sacred texts the unreality of the world is proclaimed".[19]

---

10. Martin Buber, On the Bible, p.118.
11. RSV, Bible, Exodus, 3:14, p.50.
12. Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith, p.28).
13. Martin Buber, IT, PP.142-144.
14. Martin Buber, Replies to my Critics, in Schilpp, PMB, p.698; Israel and the world, PP.22, 27.
15. Martin Buber, IT, p.104.
16. RSV Bible, Job, Chapts, 2-42, PP.539-574; Buber, EG, PP.37, 60.
17. Martin Buber, Israel and the World, Essays in a Time of Crisis, Trans.M.Friedman et.al. (New York: Schoken Book,1963), PP.32, 33.

18. RSV Genesis: I
19. S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV.No.257, P.55.

Rarest Archiver

According to Madhva, though few scriptural texts seem to identify the soul (jīva) with Brahman (God) and thereby deny the reality of the world, for example, the principal text "That thou art' (tat tvam asi), such this text must be taken only in a figurative sense, in which case they will not conflict with the verdict of pratyakṣa (perception), namely of a material world of diverse objects. Thus, by being the object of perceptual knowledge, the world is real. So also in Buber no soul can be identified with God for God cannot become IT.[20] It is in the given spatio-temporal setting, the validity imply the factual reality of the object of knowledge of the world.[21] The reality of the world thus follows from the doctrine of self-validity of knowledge.[22] If we deny the reality of the world, then the ethics would altogether cease to have any importance to humanity.[23] Thus Buber said, "if you explore the life of things and of conditioned being you come to the unfathomable, if you deny the life of things and of conditioned being you stand before nothingness, if you hallow this life you meet the living God"[24]

The experience of this world according to Madhva, rests on such Upajīvyapratyakṣa (standing ground or fundamental ground-perception) one which has passed the test of personal endorsement by the Sâkṣi (witnessing-self) after due

---

20. T.P.Ramachandran, Dvaita Vedānta,(New Delhi: Arnold Heinnman,1976) p.96; Martin Buber, IT, p.99.

21. Cf. Nym, i.18.
22. AV.iii.2.3.
23. Cf. Indian Thought and Its Development, p.60.
24. Maurice Friedmann, Op.Cit.,p.355.

Rarest Archiver

examination. [25] The scheme of Pancabheda is not illusory". "The world of duality is comprehended by the Supreme Lord and is protected by him and hence it is not a product of illusory imagination". "The supreme Self is real. The individual self is real. Difference is real, difference is real, and difference is real".[26]

Viṣṇu provides this material world as real field for the Spiritual evolution or in other words liberation of souls. Viṣṇu perceives human beings and this world as factual realities. The Lord always sees the universe. Therefore it is to be resolved that is not a magically produced illusion.[27] The creation manifests the creating and the self-communicating aspect of the divine power and glory of the Eternal Thou.

3.3.THE MEANING AND NATURE OF CREATION (SṚṢṬI) OF THE WORLD-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Both Buber and Madhva maintain that God (the Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) is the cause of the sṛṣṭi (origination) of this world. Both the thinkers have the emanationistic (that which proceeds from a source) overtones in their understanding of the theories of the origination of the world. Madhva used the terms such as *Utpatti, Udbhava, Sarga* etc., and Buber used the terminology of *not-yet-being* in their theories of the creation of the world. Both Buber (implicitly) and Madhva staunchly reject the view that the Eternal Thou (God) and Viṣṇu is the material cause (upādana-kāraṇa) of the world. God is just the efficient cause (nimitta kāraṇa) of the world. According to Madhva, the Jada

---

25. B.N.K.Sharama, Philosophy, PP.202-207.
26. S.S.Rāghavācār, VTV. Nos, 328,329, 273, p.71.
27. Ibid., VTV, No.370, p.78.

Rarest Archiver

prakṛti (primordial matter) is the upādana-karaṇa (material cause) of the world. But Buber maintains that the Eternal Thou (God) calls them (creation) out of their *not-yet-being* in to being.

In Madhva system, this material universe is neither a transformation (pariṇāma) of Brahman (Viṣṇu) nor a production de novo (or out of nothing). It is merely an actualization of what is in the womb of matter and souls by the action of Brahman. This creation is a reminder, however inadequate, of the majesty of God (cf. Dvadaśastōtra, iv.3; Madhva's commentary on Chan Up. Vi.1; NS.i.4.p.200). Creation thus gives us a glimpse into the majesty of God.[28] Again there is *the acquisition of new state of being* by the existing realities in 'creation' that is a change in dependence on the will of another i.e., Viṣṇu. This is called Parādhīnaviśēṣāpti (or the acquisition of an attribute in dependence on another.[29] God is both world's origin and dissolution and everything rests upon him.[30]

Buber maintained that God created the world out of their *not-yet-being* into being and everything of the world rests upon Him. Here Buber is so close to Madhva's understanding of the world creation. Buber tries to discover the world creation only existentially and not theologically.[31]

3.4.CREATION OUT OF 'NOT-YET-BEING' AND PARĀDHĪNAVIŚĒṢĀPTI -BUBER AND MADHVA:

---

[28]. Taitt Up.ii.8; Cf.also,B.N.K. Shrama, Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya, p.218.

[29]. Bh.Gī.VII.6-11.

[30]. Ibid.,VII.6-11.

[31]. Maurice Friedmann, Op.Cit., p.424).

Rarest Archiver

Buber advocates the creation out of 'not-yet-being into being' and Madhva propagates the doctrine of 'parādhīnaviśēṣāpti' (the acquisition of new state of being and in dependence on the will of another).

As we have already seen in summary, Madhva maintains that there are nityapadārthas (eternal realities), and through the doctrine of parādhīnaviśēṣāpti he teaches about the creation (sr̥ṣṭi). What transforms prakr̥ti (the material cause) is Viṣṇu (God) and creation is not the outcome (as generated) out of Viṣṇu.

To clarify the concept of creation as not-yet- being into being, Buber replied to the American philosopher William Poteat as, "In the biblical creation story God creates the things through the fact that *he calls them out of their not-yet-being into being; He really turns to what shall come into being*, the light, the water, the earth; and it is only the completion of this turning, when he finally says to man who has come into being, "you".[32] By creation 'not-yet-being into being', for Buber would mean that from no preexisting reality (nothing) the creation comes into being, because in the biblical creation story God creates the things through the fact that He calls them out of their not-yet-being into being. The concept of 'change' of the parkr̥ti (material cause) and the theory of parādhīnaviśēṣāpti of Madhva seems to be similar to Buber's views.

Madhva argues, "Whatever has a beginning, should have an end". So the world which has a beginning should have an end". So the world, which had a beginning, will have annihilation too at

---

[32]. Ibid.,PP.426, 427.

Rarest Archiver

the end of time. The Omnipotent God is the creator of this world.[33] The *satta* of every finite being depend on God (Viṣṇu).[34]

According to Prof. Rāghavēndrachār's view God is the Omnipotent and Supreme creator of the world and the so-called eternal entities like Prakṛti, Jīva etc., are also created in the fullest sense by God and are not coeval with Him. But Madhva scholars do not support this view of Prof. Rāghavēndrachār, which contradicts the age-old traditional understanding of Madhva doctrines.[35] All the essential qualities of everything in the world are dependent on God. [36] To show that in the doctrine of parādhīnaviśēṣāpti the independence of God is not affected, both B.N.K. Sharma and Krishna Rao argue, that if the created entities can exist for a time in separation and dependent on God, there is no reason why the same logic cannot be applied to co-eval entities also without violating God's independence. If there are two perfect and independent realities that are eternal, then the problem would arise. But they hold that if two or more realities are eternal yet are imperfect and dependent on God who is the only independent principle, then no problem can arise.[37]

---

33. Dominic, Op.Cit.,PP.259; Tapasyānanda, Bhakti Schools of Vedānta: Śrī Madhvācārya, (Madras: Śrī Ramakrishna Math,1990),p.158; Tapasyānanda, Op.Cit.,p.52.

34. Pr.Dīp.on Bh.Gi.VII.8; Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, p.168.

35. Tapasyānanda, Op.Cit.,p.50.

36. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, p.167.

37. Dominic, Op.Cit.,PP.261; Krishna Rao, Op.Cit., p.69.

Rarest Archiver

At this juncture, we try to draw few similarities between the views of Buber and Madhva through the philosophical understanding of B.N.K. Sharma and Krishna Rao who opine that hypothetically God can reverse His present method or create from nothing (out of not-yet-being). But for His (God's) own reasons, He has chosen to evolve a world from coexistent matter and souls, which co-existence too, is as much at His will and pleasure.[38] God can create out of nothing or out of not-yet-being only from His side. According to Madhva, matter, space, time, even souls are dependent for their very existence on God. so AV he says, "Dravya, Karma, Time, nature and souls exist by His grace and ceases to exist when it is withdrawn". But though theoretically an omnipotent God can annihilate a soul or create one, even the Buberian philosophers admit, He doesn't annihilate the soul once created but confers immortality upon it. If He can confer future immortality without losing His independence or undergoing limitation, can it not be the same omnipotence has willed from all time that the dependent soul should be invested with eternality.[39]

3.5.THE ETERNAL THOU-VISNU AND THE REALITY OF THE WORLD-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Both Buber and Madhva in a definite and general way maintain that the production of the world is the effect of the creative activity of God (Eternal Thou-Visnu). The Metaphysics of Buber and Madhva are realistic and for them this world

---

38. Bhag, ii.10.12.

39. Dominic, Op.Cit.,PP.261, 262; B.N.K.Sharma, Op.Cit., p.325; Krisna Rao, Op.Cit., p.69.

Rarest Archiver

(Jagat) is as real as God (Eternal Thou- Viṣṇu) Himself. The reality of the world and the reality of God are intimately related to each other. Thus the denial of the reality of the world seems to be a blasphemy against the Absolute cause of all. While Buber speaks of the creation and the reality of the world as created by God out of not-yet-being and dependent on Him, Madhva maintains that the material causality of the world i.e., Prakṛti (primordial matter) is always subservient to the will (iccha) of Viṣṇu. The Advaita and the Mādhyamika Budhism schools had completely denied the reality of the world.[40] Śaṅkara maintained that there is no such a thing called modification. The reality is only the clod of earth.[41] Both in his Ch.Up.Bh. and in VTV, Madhva has commented on this passage (Cf. Ch.Up. Bh.IV.1.ff.). The commentary in VTV is more concise and to the point[42], and this is not a teaching of non-difference". Everything has to depend on God.[43] Viṣṇu is the one creator and that the world is the effect of his action. "When the dominant principle (God) is known, the subordinate principles (World) are treated as practically known'.[44] We know the world when we know it to be the creation of Brahman, i.e., when the Supreme Being is known as the cause of the world.[45] In the same way we know the world when we know it to be the creation of Brahman, i.e., when the Supreme Being is known as the cause of the world.[46] The

---

40. Ch.Up.IV.1.ff.
41. S.Ch.Up.Bh.IV.4; SBSBh.II.1.14.
42. S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV. No.170. P.36.
43. Ibid.,VTV.No.226, p.50.
44. Ibid.,VTV.No. 241, p.52.
45. Ibid.,VTV.No.243, p.53.
46. Ibid.,VTV.No. 245, p.53.

Rarest Archiver

text 'vacarambhanām vikaro..' thrice repeated by Uddālaka seems to teach the identity of cause and effect. (Ch.Up.Bh.IV). The knowledge of the world is gained by our knowledge of Brahman.[47] In his 'I and Thou' Buber criticized Kierkegaard of his depreciation of man's relation to creation (world). Speaking of the assertion that the 'religious' man stands as a single, isolated being before God and has therefore gone beyond the responsibility and the out of the "moral man", Buber passionately protested: "But that is to suppose that God has created His world as an illusion and man for frenzied being... The world, lit by eternity, becomes fully present to him who approaches the Face, and to the Being of beings he can in a single response say Thou. Then there is no more tension between the world and God.[48]

Therefore Buber says, "Creation happens to us, burns itself into us, recasts us in burning-we tremble and are faint, we submit. We take part in creation, meet the Creator, and reach out to Him, helpers and companions"[49] On the other hand Madhva as a realistic thinker bases his epistemological premises of the reality of the world and has built his philosophy of realistic metaphysics on the rock of Sākṣi-Pratyakṣa (witnessing-self perception). Madhva maintains that the sacred literature texts like Upaniṣads especially the Brh.Up, Svet.Up, Mund.Up, Katha.Up, etc. testify the reality of the world (Jagat).

The Bhagavadgīta also clearly holds the view that jagat (world) is satya or real. *'Prakṛtim puruṣam chaiva viddhi anādi*

---

47. Puthiadam, Viṣnu the Ever Free, PP.194-198.

48. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.368.

49. Ibid.,p.368.

Rarest Archiver

ubhau api, etc. statements clearly affirm jagatsatyatva (the reality of the world). The elaborate account of *kṣētra* and God as *Kṣētrajña* cannot be meaningful unless *jagatsatyatva* accepted. Further, Gīta specifically refutes the *jaganmithyatva* theory in the verse *'asatyam apratistham te jagadahura-nisvaram'*.

Jagat provides the physical apparatus of *śarīra, antahkaraṇa* etc. to *jīva* and involves him in the experiences of pleasure that can be used or abused by *jīvas* depending upon their nature i.e., *sāttvika, rajasa* etc. The *jagat* is entirely under the control of God in respect of its essential nature and functions.[50] In his VTV, Madhva says, "Therefore, nowhere in the sacred texts the unreality of the world is proclaimed." "The supreme God, omniscient, ruling over all minds, superior to all else, and independent, created *real* entities running through all times.[51] The Lord has not magically produced the world.[52] As Buber holds that the world before is before the face of God.[53], so also for Madhva, if the world is of the nature of the non-apprehension of the self, it ought not to have been perceived as different from the self.

Again Buber maintains that the free standing ground for man is the world and that he can go forth to meet the Creator.[54] Similarly Madhva argues and teaches that the scheme of Pancabhēda is not at all illusiory because it is cognized by Viṣṇu. Viṣṇu cannot have illusions;He maintains and controlls

---

50. K.T. Pandurangi, Essentials of Bhagavadgīta, p.35; Brh.Up.III, 1, 13-24; Svet.Up.v, 5; I, 3; Mund.Up.III, 1, 12; Katha.Up.II, 2, 12.
51. S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV. Nos, 257, 258, 250, PP.55, 56.
52. Ibid.,VTV.Nos, 370, 343, 369, 354, PP.78, 74, 76.
53. Maurice Friedman, Ibid.,p.369.
54. Ibid.,P.369.

Rarest Archiver

everything.[55] The Paramopaniṣad says: 'The world resembles dreams but it is not illusiary.[56] When it is said that the world is 'māyāmaya', the sacred texts teach us that the world is the product of Viṣṇu's intelligence.[57] Sometimes the world is denoted by the term 'anrta' not because the world is false, but because it is pervaded by the Lord [58], in other words the world owes itself to Viṣṇu;[59] the World dependes on God as the rainbow depends on the sun.[60] The world has the dependent character(VTV.Ti.p, 214). As mentioned in the purāṇas the 'world resembles dreams; the world is like a dream chariot etc (VTV.No.262). As Paramōpanishad mentions, world is not sublated by any knowledge, because it is always present to the consciousness of Viṣṇu (cf.VTV.No.262). The great Soul (Viṣṇu) has created a real world and so he is called: "he whose work is true" (Satyakarma) (VTV. No.260- 'The world runs in this fashion, without beginning and end. There is no question about that. "Only those who are ignorant of the supreme power of Viṣṇu say that the world is unreal (VTV.No.260.p.56). Viṣṇu sees the universe.[61] Buber said concerning the reality of the world "If you hallow this life you meet the living God".[62]

---

55. S.S.Rāghavachār, VTV.Nos, 328, 329, 273, PP.71, 60.

56. Ibid., VTV.No.262, 57.

57. Ibid.,VTV.No.263, p.57.

58. Ibid.,VTV.No.263; VTV.Ti.p.214.

59. Ibid.,VTV.No.263; VTV.Ti.p.214.

60. Ibid.,VTV.No.263.

61. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.195-202.

62. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.355.

Rarest Archiver

3.6.GOD (ETERNAL THOU-VIṢṆU) THE CAUSE OF THE ORIGIN, SUPPORT, RULING, AND DESTRUCTION (PRALAYA) OF THE WORLD-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Both in Buber and Madhva's strong affirmation, God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) is the cause of the origin, support and destruction (only in Madhva's understanding) of this world-creation. Buber says, "in the biblical creation story (Genesis. I) God creates the things (world) through the fact that He calls them out of their not-yet-being into being. He really turns to what shall come into being, the light, the water, and the earth.[63]

Madhva, following the Vedāntic tradition affirms that God (Viṣṇu) alone is the cause of the Production (Sṛṣṭi), Support (Sthithi) and Destruction or Dissolution (Saṁhāra) of this Universe; and the sacred tradition teaches about this truth (AV.I.1.90; BSBh.I.1.2). In his AV he affirms, in the very first verse we find, 'He from whom the origination etc., of the universe' are, is Viṣṇu (AV.I.1.90). Bādarāyaṇa's assertion: 'he from whom the origination etc, 'Clearly points to Viṣṇu as the cause of the universe (AV.I.1.2). It is from Viṣṇu proceed 'origination or Creation (sṛṣṭi); Sustenance or Support (Sthithi), Dissolution (Saṁhāra); Control or government (niyamana); Obscuration or ignorance (ajñāna); Enlightenment or knowledge (jñāna); Bondage (bandha); and finally Release or liberation (mokṣa) (BSBh.I.1.2).

Buber uses the terms like, 'origin' 'creation' etc, likewise Madhva uses in his AV and VTV many terms like *'udbhava' 'utpati', sṛṣṭi and 'janma'* to express his main idea to prove

---

63. Ibid., p.426.

Rarest Archiver

and to signify that Viṣṇu alone is the cause of this universe (AV.I.1.1. asyodbhāvadidam). Buber uses the terms like 'Creator', 'God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, God of the living, to prove his idea that God is the creator of this world. So also Madhva makes use of the terms such as Pitṛ (Pitā), janitr (janita), sraṣṭa, sarvkarta etc. and applies them to Viṣṇu to show that Viṣṇu is the father or progenitor of this universe (BSBh.I.1.2).

It is said in the Old Testament of the Bible that God created the world,[64] and Buber referred to it in his system. In the Bhagavadgīta, Kṛṣṇa says to Arjuna, "Of all that is material .....I am both its origin and dissolution.[65]. Hence, Madhva in his Bhagavadgīta Bhāshya teaches that Viṣṇu is the cause of the creation and the destruction of the entire universe. He is omniscient, beginningless, subtle, Sustainer of all, and beyond death or destruction.[66] God creates this world as good and not as evil but the continually growing world of IT overruns human world and robs him of the reality of his own I-non-salvation.[67] In fact the very manifestation of all finite

---

64. RSV Bible, Genesis, I: 1.
65. Bh.Gīt.Ch.7.text.6.
66. B.N.K.Sharama, Bhagavadgīta Bhāshya of Madhvācārya, (Bangalore: Anandatīrtha Pratishthāna, 1989), Adhyaya, VII.6, p.159.
67. Martin Buber, IT, p. 66.
68. Puthiadam Viṣṇu the Ever Free, pp.165, 166.
69. R.E. Hume, Trans. p.290; Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP. 153-154.
70. The Great Ideas Today, 1967, Britannica Great Books, PP.315, 316.
71. GBWW, Vol.33, p.280b, The Great Ideas Today, 1967, Britannica Great Books, P.333.

Rarest Archiver

beings depends on Viṣṇu.[68] The definition of God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) for Buber and Madhva is that He is the creator, sustainer and destroyer (in Madhva). According to Madhva, innumerable Vēdic passages reveal this truth (BSBh.I.1.2; in his commentary on BS.I.1.2. Madhva refers to Ṛg.V.X.125.1-8; ibid.I.164; Tait.Up. III.1. "That, verily, whence beings here are born, that by which when born they live, that into which on deceasing they enter".[69] Pascal called God as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Him to whom one can say Thou.[70] Buber's God is the God of love in the world creation. "The entire religion of the Jews," remarks Pascal, "consisted only of the love of God as the cretor".[71]

3.7.GOD AS THE SUSTAINER (STHITI), RULER(NIYATI) AND DESTROYER (PRALAYA) OF THE WORLD-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber and Madhva affirm that God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu) is the cause of sustenance (sthiti), ruling (niyati). But Buber is not more specific and explicit as regards the dissolution of the world is concerned where as Madhva speaks of the dissolution of the world. In Madhva, Viṣṇu (God) is the mūladhāraka or the primary supporter of the world; and the world will disappear if Viṣṇu does not wish to support it. Hence in Madhva it is the will (iccha) of Viṣṇu that is the source and support of the world and of all things, beings in the world. In Madhva's assertion, all the creatures are dependent (asvātantra) on Viṣṇu for their satta (existence) and pravṛtti (activity). Creation,

Rarest Archiver

revelation and redemption show themselves as three aspects of a single event in Buber's system.[72] The world and creatures cease to exist without the revelation (conversation), providence and sustenance of God.[73] Madhva teaches that Viṣnu, in order to support and govern the creation of the world, uses the inferior (gods) beings; and therefore there are presiding dēvatas or deities (gods) to each element of beings.

Though Madhva uses the terminology like 'pralaya' (dissolution) of the world, he does not mean complete annihilation of the world, but teaches that the world returns to its unmanifest state of existence. Buber seems to speak of the destruction of the world in other words of the augmentation of the "IT' (of I-IT relationship) world. Thus he says, "If a man lets it have the mastery…. ghost within him whisper to one another the confession of their non-salvation".[74]

As regards the time in Buber and Madhva, it is cyclic in Madhva and eternality in Buber's understanding. In Madhva's understanding the cycle of creation (sṛṣti), sustenance (sthiti) and dissolution (pralaya) are in continuous process and from eternity to eternity. As a Jew Buber would understand that there could be only one creation and destruction (annihilation) of the world creation.

3.8.THE PURPOSE, MOTIVE, UTILITY (PRAYŌJANA) OF CREATION IN BUBER AND MADHVA:

---

72. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,PP.367, 371.
73. The Great Ideas Today, 1967, Britannica Great Books, p.322.
74. Martin Buber,IT, p.66.

Rarest Archiver

As it is mentioned in the Holy Bible, God speaks and the world is created.[75] so Buber understands that the creation is a free act of the address of God (Eternal Thou). Madhva too admits that the creation is the free act of Brahman (Viṣṇu). Both the thinkers think that no external power can move the Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu to create but Himself alone. Buber's God is the God of love and absolutely perfect Thou.[76] Similarly Madhva too understands his God (Viṣṇu) as the fullness of ānanda (bliss) and absolutely perfect Being. God does not draw any utility or profit from the work of His creation. Thus according to Buber, God has not made His creatures as His tools but He invited them to be true and authentic partners of I-Thou relationship with Him and each other. Madhva too uses the terminology viz., 'na prayōjanaya sṛṣṭiḥ'[77] to say that Viṣṇu does not derive any utility or profit from his work of creation.

The purpose of creation is that God can be addressed in it.[78] God is not an idea; He enters into a direct relation with us men in creative, revealing and redeeming acts. He is the ground and meaning of our existence that constitutes mutuality, arising again and again such as man subsists only between persons.[79] God really turns to (creation) what shall come into being, the light, the water, and the earth.[80] The world-creation has not proceeded from the Eternal Thou (God) out of necessity.

---

75. RSV, BIBLE, Genesis: 1
76. The Great Ideas Today, 1967, Britannica Great Books, p. 333; GBWW, Vol.33, p.280b.
77. BSBh.II.1.33.
78. Martin Buber, The Origin and Meaning of Hassidism, PP.91-92.
79. Martin Buber, IT, p.168.
80. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,PP. 426, 427.

Rarest Archiver

Thus Buber says, 'God does not deal here with something with which he otherwise has nothing to do'.[81]

In Madhva's opinion, Viṣṇu engages Himself in creating and annihilating this world out of play (Līla) like an intoxicated person who sings and dances in the exuberance of sheer delight or happiness and not for the sake of gaining some definite goal. This sport of Viṣṇu is rooted (BSBh.I.1.14) in the bliss of Viṣṇu and it is identical with His nature. Viṣṇu does not produce the world because of his play (līla) as though He were in need of such a play, or as though He derived some pleasure from such an activity. The free Lord acts because such is His blissful nature and His activity of creation is nothing more than an act of willing-iccha (AV.II.1.108). Hence this universe arises out of the ānanda (bliss) or sukaha of Viṣṇu. Madhva clarifies us that Viṣṇu alone is the reason for the creation of this universe. There is no any extrinsic agency or motivation that determines Him to create this universe.[82]

The purpose of creation is that God gives man ground on which to stand and yet that the very meaning of man's free standing on this ground is that he can go forth to meet the Creator who addresses Him in every aspect of his creation.[83] The purpose of creation of the Eternal Thou is His I-Thou communication to all His creatures and between man and man. In Buber, the completion and purpose of creation and the response to revelation are the beginning of redemption as a single

---

81. Ibid.,PP. 426, 427-28.
82. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.184-185.
83. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.369.

Rarest Archiver

event.[84] Visnu provides the creation as an opportunity for the souls (Jīvas) to have their realization of 'svarūpatvam' called the essential nature. In other words it is the self-realization of the souls in creation. Visnu, out of His love for the souls, creates the creation so that the souls in return by taking part in the world process would reach their salvific goal or mukti.

3.9.CREATION IN TIME-ETERNITY AND ETERNAL CREATION'-BUBER AND MADHVA:

In Buber's affirmation, God created the world in time from all eternity. God as the Absolute Thou addresses enters into a direct relation with us men in creative, revealing and redeeming acts through becoming a Person for us in I-Thou relationship. God really turns (Himself) to (creation) what shall come into being, the light, the water, and the earth.[85] The cause of creation and creatures is the will of the Eternal Thou in time from eternity. According to Madhva's teaching, the process of creation is eternal without beginning or end (pravahato anādi) because the matter (Jada prakrti) and souls (Jīvas) co-exist with Visnu. Though Buber seems to understand the creation as in time, yet he has no difficulties to maintain that the Eternal Thou (God) created the world from all eternity (creatio ab Aeterno). In Madhva's conception, the *'satta'* of the eternal realities are eternally dependent on the will of God (Eternal Thou-Visnu), so at this level we can conclude great similarity to Buber's idea of creation from all eternity.[86] When we understand correctly Madhva's view of the creation of eternal

---

84. Ibid.,pp.370-371.
85. Ibid.,PP. 426, 427.
86. Puthiadam, God, p.77).

Rarest Archiver

substances through 'parādhīna-viśeṣāpti', it will show that from all eternity, in the sense of positing an eternal and *constant dependence* of all finite reality in each and every one of its states of being and becoming (*sadbhāvavikāras*) and the eight-fold cosmic determinations (*sṛṣṭyadyastakam*), upon the one Infinite and Independent Principle viz., God. This is the utmost limit to which any philosophical theory of creation can go, short of assuming creation in time of even eternal substances, in some remote undiscoverable past, *ex nihilo*, which is fraught with logical contradictions.[87] There can be no real distinction between the divine substance and divine (creative) activity as God is pure existence, simple and unchangeable (immutable).

3.10.GOD AND SĀDHANAS (INSTRUMENTS) USED-BUBER-MADHVA:

Buber does not accept any sādhanas or instruments used in creation; and according to him, this world creation is not a change or passage from anything. Therefore we do not find any intermediary between the Eternal Thou who creates and the created world-creation. God speaks and the world is created instantaneously or immediately,[88] and it is an immediate act. By essence the creation is exclusively the action proper to the Eternal Thou and God as Supreme and Eternal Being can only produce this world creation.

Madhva teaches that Viṣṇu makes use of sādhanas (instruments) viz., Jada prakriti (primordial matter), Jīvas (souls) and Karma (action) in creation but these sādhanas do not curtail or determine the independence of Him because it is Viṣnu who determines their power to be instruments in His creation. It

---

87. B.N.K. Sharma, Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya, PP.223, 224.

88. RSV.Bible, Genesis, I.

Rarest Archiver

is the very iccha (will) of Visnu that determines the use of the instruments in creation.

3.11.MAN'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE WORLD-BUBER AND MADHVA:

In Buber, man has specific relationship in three spheres of the world or world-ambient (Umwelt), such as his life with Nature, human beings and spiritual beings.[89] In Madhva the conception of the world of man is called 'bhu-lōka (earth) and it forms part of a complex system of worlds.[90] Both Buber and Madhva maintain that man exists in a milieu, he exists in a world, which is in time and space; other human beings in the world surround him. According to them man is a member of a society of nature, men, and spiritual beings. Though man can condition his world, the world cannot condition him; and in this sense he is free. To American philosopher William Poteat Buber said, "I do not say that the world is twofold, rather, the world is twofold to man. I do not thereby say anything concerning anything existing independently of man.[91] Buber said, "TO MAN the world is twofold, in accordance with twofold attitude"[92]; which represent the authentic and unauthentic postures towards this world; and John Macmurray calls these attitudes as the personal and impersonal ones which Buber termed these fundamental postures as the I-THOU and I-IT attitudes of realizing and orienting.[93]

---

89. Martin Buber, I and You, Trans. by Walter Kaufmann, pp.56-57.
90. Puthiadam, Visnu the Ever Free, p.225.
91. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.426.
92. Martin Buber, IT, p.15.
93. Ibid., p. 15.

Rarest Archiver

CHAPTER- 4

INTER-RELATIONSHIP AMONG THOU (BRAHMAN), I (JĪVA) AND IT (JAGAT)

4.0. INTRODUCTION:

In Buber, the God (Yahweh) of the Old Testament of the Bible is the 'Eternal Thou' whom man meets in the true life of I-Thou relationship. Madhva held that Brahman (God) is the Supreme Viṣṇu. The Śruti texts mention and speak only about the Supreme Viṣṇu.[1]

Buber accepted the Biblical story of Creation (RSV Bible, Genesis, 2:7) where God formed man(I-Adam) from the dust of the ground. In his 'Creation, Revelation, and Redemption' Buber affirmed the creation of man and wrote, " When He finally says to man who has come into being, "You"[2]. In Buber's affirmation, God created man out of earth who is material in nature and Madhva too agrees to this, maintaining, that man (body-soul composite being) is the evolutes of matter (earth). But in Madhva, Viṣṇu does not create man (Jīva) but it exits from all eternity. Buber says, we as mortals (of mortality) meet God in God's very giving and in his man's receiving of the concrete situation'; and "He (God) so to speak, became one in creating Man..."[3]; and 'what gives life to man (I) and movement is the 'Thou relationship with the other beings because man (I-Jīva) is the creation of God. We are born as individual and later we become persons. "There is no 'I' taken in itself, but only the I

---

1. S.S.Rāghavàcār, VTV.No.1.p.1.
2. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.427.
3. The Great Ideas Today, 1967, Britannica Great Books, pp. 329, 338.

Rarest Archiver

of the primary word I-Thou and the I of the primary word I-It. when man says I he refers to one or other of these. The I to which he refers is present when he says I. Further, when he says Thou or IT, the I of one of the two primary words is present. The existence of I and the speaking of I are one and the same thing. When a primary word is spoken the speaker enters the word and takes his stand in it".[4] It is clear that explicit meaning of 'I' of man is the soul of man in the Buberian philosophy. This can be proved from the following lines as, "Insofar as the soul is comprehended exclusively as 'I', however, it is comprehended in amputation, in abstraction, not in its whole existence. Later Buber uses 'spirit' for the I(soul) that exists in man.[5] What is elementally perceived is what takes place in one's own soul'[6]

According to Madhva doctrine, Viṣṇu (Brahman) does not create the Jīvas, as they exist from eternity; and Jīva (man) exists here and there in body- matter- or rather bodies. There are many bodies and every Jīva (I) that is caught up in the human situation possess a gross (it is eternal) and a subtle body (product of subtle matter). The subtle body is united to the Jīva from eternity and will remain united to it till liberation (mukti) is attained. It wanders with the soul in the course of its transmigrate existence (Kath.Up.Bh.p.12). The connection between the soul and matter is beginningless (BSBh.II.4.22, 23). So the situation of man as man arises when a finite spiritual soul, gross body and fine body join together to form a single unit and when this whole composite is 'covered

---

4. Martin Buber, IT, P.16.
5. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.350.
6. Ibid.,p.351.

Rarest Archiver

over' by ignorance. In Madhva's opinion, a body may have more than one soul (BSBh.III.1.25, 26). Like soul and matter, positive ignorance too is ultimately under the control of Viṣṇu and it is he who causes it to arise end to enchain the soul to the bodies.[7]

Buber affirms that human beings (I's- souls) are created in the image of God and higher than the material and other beings. Thus he says, "that masterpiece of man's construction, is only the image of images, the most lofty of all images…"[8] Madhva, believes and affirms that the Jivas (I) are similar in nature to others as well and in their rebirth they transmigrate from human bodies to plant or animal or vice versa.

Madhva strongly asserted that Viṣṇu alone is Svātantra - independent and all other beings (including the I-Jīvas) are Asvātantra (dependent) on God for their *satta(reality)*. In Buber's system the Thous (I-Jīvas) has the nature of 'inborn Thou' (of I-Thou relationship) and in Madhva's understanding too they have all bliss (ānanda) and consciousness. Therefore in Madhva the I-Jīvas are *cētana* (sentient substance) and the *prakṛti* (matter) is the insentient substance (*acētana dṛavya)*.

Buber as an existential philosopher very strongly maintains that when God created man (I), He called man into the I-Thou relationship … when He finally says to man who has come into being, "You" (Thou); and again Buber says, "The Eternal Thou is nearer to me than my I".[8] In Buber and Madhva's teachings, Eternal Thou- Viṣṇu (Brahman) through His grace

---

7. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.217, 218, 237.

8. The Great Ideas Today, 1967, Britannica Great Books, p.339.
8. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,pp. 427, 354-355.

Rarest Archiver

(prasāda) gives an opportunity for the I-Jīva (soul), which is in union with the body (matter) at birth in the world, to attain its ultimate end, which is mokṣa (heaven). The Eternal Thou of Buber provides the I-Jīva (man) with union of body in order to attain his perception and more particularly the I-Thou relationship to which he (I) is called, and where as the Brahman (Viṣṇu) of Madhva gives an opportunity to the Jīva to act according to its nature (svarūpa) and attain its final end which is mokṣa in this karma-saṁsāra-a place of bondage because of its past karmas.

4.1.THE PLURALITY AND HIERARCHY OF I-JĪVA (OF BEINGS)-BUBER AND MADHVA:

In Buber's affirmation, God intends multiplicity and diversity of beings (I's) as Human beings, Spiritual beings and beings in the nature (plants, animals, art, music etc) and He desires that all beings (I's) share and represent his perfection of I-Thou relationship according to their nature of beings. There is the breath of the Eternal Thou and in each; and in each Thou we address the eternal Thou.[9] Madhva points out the Jīva-traividhya (tri-partite) classification of the Jīvas like, the Salvable or Sātvika (Mukti-yōgyas), Ever migrating or rajasika (Nitya-saṁsārin) and the damnable or Tāmasika (Tamō-yōgya) Jīvas. The Jīvas reflect Viṣṇu's perfection according to their nature in varying degrees. The being of I-IT steps between humanbeings and God.[10]

4.2.THE 'I'-JĪVA AND GOD (ETERNAL THOU-VIṢṆU)-BUBER AND MADHVA:

---

9. Martin Buber, IT, p. 130.
10. Martin Buber, EG, pp.23, 129.

Rarest Archiver

There is a relation of similarity and dependence between the Eternal Thou-Brahman-Viṣṇu and I-Jīva. Though man (I-Jīva) is created in the image and likeness of Eternal Thou, yet He invites him to encounter Him only in the I-Thou relationship. Every I-Jīva is the glimpse through to Eternal Thou in other words I-Jīva is the pratibimba of Brahman-Viṣṇu (bimba) or the reflection of the reflected -bimba-pratibimbabhāva.

God created man (soul) from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man(I-Jīva) became a living being as the image of God (RSV Bible, Genesis, 1:27; 2:7, PP.1-2). The Eternal Thou finally said to man who has come into being, "You".[11] God of the nature of 'inborn-Thou' is to be realized in each relationship of I-Jiva.[12] The presence of the Eternal Thou is felt in each element of the I-Thou.[13]; and the Eternal Thou though can be met in each particular Thou (I-Jīva), yet He cannot be fixed in any of them[14], because the Eternal Thou is the perfect infinite Being and the Absolute Person, who cannot be limited either from us or from our relations with other I-Jīvas.[15] The Eternal Thou requires man (I-Jīva) to stand over against Him from the latter's birth to death.[16] Though every sphere is compassed in the Eternal Thou, yet He is not compassed in any of them but in man.[17]

---

11. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.427.
12. Martin Buber, IT.p.99.
13. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.340.
14. Ibid.,p.354.
15. Martin Buber, IT, PP.169, 170.
16. Ibid.,PP.130-132, 167.
17. Ibid.,p.130.

Rarest Archiver

The relation of Brahman-Viṣṇu and I-Jīva is also one of similarity (sādṛsya) and dependence (adhīnatva), which is called '*bhēdabhēda*'. Brahaman-Viṣṇu shares with the I-Jīva His essential attributes like existence (sat), consciousness (cit) and bliss (ānanda), and in this way the I-Jīva is said to be little similar (alpasāmya) to Him. As Viṣṇu is eternal, uncreated and indestructible, so likewise the I-Jīvas are also; and further they belong to cetana dṛvya. Brahman-Viṣṇu's similarity or I-Jīva's similarity to Him is only in kind and not in degree. Eternal Thou-Brahman-Viṣṇu has His own individuality unlike the individuality of each I-Jīva. In the Buberian system, the Eternal Thou's relationship with every I-Jīva (man) is, as a partner in I-Thou relationship and where as in Madhvism, the relationship between Brahman-Viṣṇu's and I-Jīva is of King-Subject, Father-Son relationship. Though the Eternal Thou - Brahman-Viṣṇu is the ground (antayāmin- inner ruler) of I-Jīva, yet He is not affected by the sufferings or evils of them.

4.3.THE PROBLEM OF EVIL-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber maintains that with the absence of I-Thou relationship between the Eternal Thou, I-Jīvas and other beings, there exits evil. Eternal Thou and Brahman-Vīsnu is not attached to evil that exists in the I-Jīvas and world. He is not responsible for the existence of evil. God created everything good.[18] The growing I-IT attitude steps in between Him and the I-Jīvas that closes off from I-Jīva the light of heaven (God).[19] The degenerated man of the I-IT has caused the evil that has

---

[18]. RSV.Bible, Genesis, 1.

[19]. Martin Buber, EG, PP.23, 129; Great Ideas Today, 1967, Britannica Great Books, p.323).

Rarest Archiver

come between God and man I-Jīva.[20] In the words of Holderlin, there seems to be no divine without which our generation is walking in the night.[21] But God can never be absent from I-Jiva and the creation because He is nearer to I-Jiva than its own self.[22] Man (Adam) sinned and went astray of God.[23]

According to Buber and Madhva the characteristic mark of this IT-Jagat (world) is the inequalities that exist among I-Jīvas (beings, creatures).[24] The finite I-Jīvas (beings, creatures) that exists in the IT-Jagat are corporeal or corruptible and when they loose their inner goodness of perfection, cause evil in the world. With the presence of some corruptible I-Jīvas (creatures, beings) necessarily and invariably there is the presence of evil in the IT-Jagat. The Eternal Thou has not created this universe as unequal but the I-Jīvas make it unequal through their I-IT attitude; whereas the Brahman-Viṣṇu in Madhvism is said to have created this unequal universe (IT-Jagat). So He is said to be the cause of evil, but only accidentally and never purposefully. From the part of the Eternal Thou and Brahman (Viṣṇu) of Buber and Madhva there is the incomprehensible and tremendous hiddenness towards I-Jīva. God (Eternal Thou-Brahman-Viṣṇu) God Himself chooses this type of hiddennes from I-Jīva through which the life of I-Jīva at times becomes unbearable.[25]

---

20. Ibid., p.129.
21. Great Ideas Today, 1967, Britannica, Great Books, p.322.
22. Martin Buber, IT, p.104.
23. RSV.Bible, Genesis: 3.
24. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, p.257.
25. Martin Buber, EG, PP.37, 60.

Rarest Archiver

The damnable Jivas (Tamoyōgyas) are basically evil that will evil (I-IT and sin-papa) in this universe. God (Brahman-Viṣṇu) does not have contradictions. The I-Jīva himself is an actor in the sense described, and he is the enjoyer of the fruits of his action.[26]

4.4.THE INTER-RELATIONSHIP AMONG 'I'-JIVA AND THE I-JAGAT-BUBER AND MADHVA:

There is divine meaning in the life of the IT-Jagat (world) for I-Jīvas (man). This IT-Jagat (Creation) happens to I-Jīvas. The I-Jīvas take part in IT-Jagat (creation), meet the Creator (Eternal Thou), and reach out to Him, helpers, and companions. The I-Jīva (Man) is given a ground on which to stand and that he is able to go out to meet His God (Eternal Thou).[27] The I-Jīva and IT-Jagat are two series of opposite pictures, yet they both have written under them: "One and all". Buber's system affirmed that (I-Jīva) and IT-Jagat (world) as two independent yet interacting realities: "Certainly the world "dwells" in me as an image, just as I dwell in it as a thing. There can also be miscarrying in the community but the faithful faith is important here.[28] Through beholding the earth, we behold God and eternally form His form. God is wholly present in the IT-Jagat (world).[29] Whoever sees the world in the Eternal Thou (God) stands in His presence[30]; because God is the mystery of the

---

26. Tapasyānanda, Op.Cit.,PP.72-73.

27. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit., P.367-369.

28. Ibid.,PP.346-353.

29. Ibid.,PP.354-355.

30. Martin Buber, IT, p.122.

Rarest Archiver

self-evident that is "closer to me than my own I.[31] One need not shun this word as evil but find purity and deep spiritual joy in the service of God and fellowbeings.[32] I-Jīva (Man) alone has a world and though conditioned by the IT-Jagat (world), he is able to condition his world and transcend the necessities of his life. The I-Jīva (man) is called to establish the world of I-Thou relationship because the I-Thou establishes the world of relation.[33] The *IT-Jagat* is entirely under the control of God (Brahman-Viṣṇu) in respect of its essential nature and functions.[35] "Only those who are ignorant of the supreme power of Eternal Thou -Brahman-Viṣṇu say that the IT-Jagat is unreal.[36] All beings exist in the IT-Jagat.

The I-Jīva (man) is concrete Body-Soul composite being and he is a finite, spiritual being who exists in a milieu and the Jagat (world). This material world is the field (sādhanabhumi) that Eternal Thou-Brahman-Viṣṇu provides for the spiritual evolution of the I-Jīvas or the liberation of I-Jīvas in the I-Thou relationship

4.5.THE I-JĪVA (MAN) EXISTS IN THE IT-JAGAT(WORLD)-BUBER AND MĀDHVA:

In Buber's system the twofold distinction among I-Jīva (man) such as I-Jīva (man) of I-Thou (Loyal selves) and I-Jīva (man) of I-IT (Disloyal selves-demonic Thous) exist in the world. Man of I-IT sees the beings around him as Its, as

---

31. Ibid.,p.104.
32. Francis J.Lescoe, Existentialism, p.41
33. Martin Buber, IT, p.18.
35. K.T. Pandurangi, Essentials of Bhagavadgīta, p.35.
36. S.S.Rāghavachār,VTV.No.260.p.56.

Rarest Archiver

machines capable of various achievements, which must be taken into account and utilized for the Cause.[37] According to the inner structure of I-Jīva Madhvism too ontologically admits threefold categories of I-Jīvas (men) as eternally liberated (Laksmi or Ramā or Śrī), those fit for liberation (muktiyōgyas) and those which are unfit for liberation (tamoyōgyas); and the I-Jīvas exist and act according to their 'svarūpabhēda'-the difference in the essential nature of beings. The loyal selves (I-Thou) pledge to the other Thous (I-Jīvas) in bonds of covenant, exchange vows of fidelity and claims upon the other (I-Jīvas in Thou relationship).[38] The disloyal or False Selves (I-IT) relate to other I-Jīvas only in observing, using, objectifying, utilization of them (Thous). They are wholly passive and have only past.[39]

Madhva holds, from all eternity Viṣṇu has given (to all I-Jīvas according to Buber's doctrine) and to each I-Jīva the nature (svarūpa) an aptitude or capacity (yōgyata) to occupy a definite position, and accomplish certain functions in the world (cf. Mbh.T.N. XXII.184-88). This Yōgyata fixes all the hierarchy of I-Jīvas, their functions, and their future destiny in the Jagat. The Buberian and Madhva doctrine maintain that the whole IT-Jagat (universe) is made up of a hierarchy of real and ordered spiritual and material beings (I-Jīvas and inanimate beings). The I-Jīvas (souls) fit for salvation (redemption) are in this IT-Jagat (universe) so that they might with the help of

---

37. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,PP.345-346.

38. Francis J.Lescoe, Existentialism, p.161.

39. Michael Wyschogrod, Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Vol.1&2, p.410).

Rarest Archiver

Eternal Thou-Brahman-Viṣṇu's grace work out their final destiny.[40]

4.6.THE ETERNAL THOU-BRAHMAN-VIṢṆU AND I-JĪVA (MAN) AND SOCIETY-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Though Madhva too like all the other teachers traditional Hindu thought in the Dharma literature of his time accepted 'cast ethics' and caste as the divine origin with its absolute character and the existence of family and family duties[41], yet, all his writings and teachings portray that Madhva was modern, realist and practical, existentialist anthropological thinker like the Buber. Buber only believes in the caste ethics of 'I-Thou relationship' that is willed by the Eternal Thou (God). The concept 'human inter-communion' or the 'between'-interhuman' are the philosophical and theological foundations for the anthropocentric and existential systems of Buber and Madhva.

Madhva affirms that a bhakta (devotee) must seek the company of the devotees (bhaktasaṅgha) and yōgin (one who has advanced in practice of asceticism (tapas) to work for his own salvation (mukti).[42] The devotees of Brahman-Viṣṇu have the duty to teach others (BSBh.IV.1.3), like Buber's concept that every person has the duty to relate with the other in I-Thou relationship of the Eternal Thou. One must serve the devotees of Brahman-Viṣṇu; and by means of group discussion he has easily know the subtle truth concerning Brahman-Viṣṇu (Kathālakṣaṇa).[43] The 'Interhuman-Between' and the 'loving community to achieve

---

40. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.262-264.
41. Bh.Gī.II.18, 31.
42. Glasenapp, Op..Cit.,p.92-93.
43. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.252-256.

Rarest Archiver

salvation in God' concept of Buber has close affinity to Madhva system. Giving gifts and alms (dāna) is necessary for every one since God dwells in all I-Jīvas (men) and other beings, I-Jīva must have a universal, benevolent attitude to everything.[44]

4.7.I-JĪVA'S (MAN'S) LAST DESTINY-BUBER AND MADHVA:

The Buberian and Madhvism maintain that the Eternal Thou-Brahman-Viṣṇu (God) is the ultimate last destiny for I-Jīva; and it can attain its perfect happiness through entering and realizing its inborn I-Thou relationship or the spirit of inborn Thou with the Eternal Thou, man and other beings in the I-Jagat (world). In Madhva's opinion, I-Jīva (man) can attain his perfect happiness only through the prasāda (grace) of Supreme Brahman-Viṣṇu; and the perfect happiness or bliss (ānanda) consists in the glorious vision of Viṣṇu (God). According Buber, every I-Jīva in this IT-Jagat (world) is destined to become a thing (IT) or at least to enter into thinghood by its nature again and again [45]; and he is the lord of the hour"[46]; and that is the melancholy of I-Jīva (man) and his greatness today.[47] The I is required to live in virtue of the spirit".[48] There is the progressive tendency of "Vital disassociation" as the "palpable manifestation of modern I-Jīva's (man's) lack of relationship.[49] And this is the sickness of the people of our time". The I-Jīva (man) of the I-IT world "steps in between and

---

44. Bh.Gī.Bh.VI.32; VI.30: Cf.also, Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.256-257.
45. Martin Buber, 'I and Thou', Tr. by, Walter Kaufman, PP.73-74.
46. Martin Buber, EG, p.129
47. Martin Buber, IT, p.58.
48. Ibid.,p.58.
49. Ibid.,p.137.

Rarest Archiver

shuts off from us the light of heaven" [50]; and the veiling of the divine countenance has taken place.[51]

In Madhva system, the immediate cause for the bondage of I-Jīva is its avidya (svabhāvajñāna) or ajñāna (ignorance) with which Brahman-Viṣṇu veils the I-Jīva binds it to the body (matter). In Buber's opinion the ultimate cause of liberation or redemption must come from the I-Jīva's side through the event of the 'between'.[53] In Madhva system Brahman-Viṣṇu through his grace is the ultimate cause of liberation or mukti of I-Jīva by which I-Jīva has (Brahmasakṣātkara). In Buber's conception, the redemption again and again comes from man's (I-Jīva's) side (in Between) as the event.[54] In the redemption of 'I-Thou', the problematic, the 'evil' are brought though unreduced and undenied, yet transformed and transmuted into the renewed reality of relationship.[55] The I-Jīva must reach out to Him (God), helpers and companions because it is its destiny.[56]

4.8.THE MEANS OF LIBERATION-REDEMPTION OF I-JĪVA-BUBER AND MADHVA:

The Buberian system maintains that I-Thou genuine and reciprocal relationship in sphere of the 'between-interhuman' is the means of I-Jīva's redemption and to exit with others and in communion with others (Thous) is the real redemption. "As I (Jīva) become I (Jīva), I (Jīva) say Thou.[57] And the self (I-

---

50. Martin Buber, EG, p.129.
51. Ibid.,PP.22-23, 66-68.
53. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.370.
54. Ibid.,pp.370, 371.
55. Ibid.,p.371.
56. Ibid.,p.368.
57. Martin Buber, IT, PP.24, 25.

Rarest Archiver

Jīva) becomes I, in saying Thou,[58] this is the redeeming message to the modern world of the salvation of I-Jīva (man). In the Madhva system, though the sādhanas such as Vairāgya-non-attachment, Karma-mārga or Karmayōga- the way of works, Jñāna-mārga-- the way of knowledge and Bhakti-mārga--the way of devotion etc, do not bring to I-Jīva the immediate and direct liberation (mukti) but ultimately it is the grace (prasāda) of Brahman-Viṣṇu that gives the final liberation to I-Jīva and the I-Jīva has the direct experience of Him. The I-Jīva has to detach and renounce the I-IT world and the bodily cravings and pleasures of this earthly life in order to be completely redeemed or liberated and perform actions (duties and I-Thou relationship) without any desire for results and with a mind devoted to the Eternal Thou -Brahman-Viṣṇu.[60] For the means of one's liberation the way of knowledge of Eternal Thou-Brahman-Viṣṇu that consists in the I-Thou relationship, hearing (śravaṇa), reflection (manana), nididhyāsana (contemplation) are necessary with the Upāsana (meditation) which takes the form of either remembrance (smṛti) or of meditation (dhyāna).[61] Honouring one's own teachers or gurus are also the means of salvation. Idol worship is not a means of liberation.[62] Through the persistent and continuous devotion (bhakti) and (ekānta-bhāva) towards the Eternal Thou-Brahman-Viṣṇu and with the purity of motive (sudha-bhāva) inclusive of the I -Thou pure-

---

58. Ibid.,p.121.
60. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, p.281).
61. BSBh, III, 3.43;Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, PP.289, 290.
62. B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy of Madhvācārya, p.412.

Rarest Archiver

genuine- reciprocal relationship, the I-Jīva obtains the grace (prasāda) of God and ultimate union with Him.

4.9.LIFE OF I-JĪVA BEYOND DEATH- ESCHATOLOGY-BUBER AND MADHVA:

In Buber's belief, the concept of heaven or hell as the final destiny consist only in and through the I-Thou relationship of the 'between'-interhuman-community. The I-Jīva can realize its heaven (I-Thou) or hell (I-IT) here in this IT-Jagat (world) itself and heaven or hell is one's state of relationship with the other beings (Thous-Jīvas). The community of persons is the original idea of humanity, a transcendental norm, or an eschatological promise for I-Jīva (man). Madhvism maintains that after the death the I-Jīva goes to its final destiny of heaven (mokṣa) or hell according to its nature (svarūpa) and actions performed in this world. The heaven or hell is a state and a place and there is bliss (ānanda) in heaven (bliss is real and positive in heaven) and eternal punishment in the hell. The I-Jīvas are said to preserve their individuality and identity even in heaven and there is the gradation of ānanda in heaven between the I- Jīvas.

4.10.THE JOURNEY OF THE I-JĪVA AFTER DEATH-BUBER AND MADHVA:

In Buber's understanding, the partnership of man with Eternal Thou (God) in the world the rising of a human cosmos built out of genuine community and a redemptive life of relationship, the shining, streaming constancy that the Thou may win in the IT, are all hints of redemption.[63] According to the Madhva doctrine, the liberation of the I-Jīva in the full sense

---

[63]. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.370.

Rarest Archiver

comes only after the fall of the physical body on the exhaustion of prārabdha-karma or that quantum of karma that has brought the present body into existence.[64] Until the prārabdha-karma persists, the body of I-Jīva is said to function and at the fall of linga-śarīra (gross body or physical body), the aparokṣa-jñāni rises from the linga-śarīra to the dēvaloka (world of gods); and in this stage, he waits till the entire IT-Jagat (universe-cosmos) is to be dissolved by Brahman-Viṣṇu. Only at the time of dissolution of the IT-Jagat (world) the subtle body (linga-śarīra) is destroyed and there is the proper release of I-Jīva; and then follows the state of the enjoyment of never ending mokṣa (bliss) of I-Jīva. The Nitya-saṁsārin I-Jīvas and those, whose karmas are not yet exhausted, undergo transmigration in the IT-Jagat (world); where as the tamoyōgya I-Jīvas are damned into eternal hell. Further, there is again sṛṣṭi IT-Jagat (creation) altogether, i.e., sṛṣṭi, sthithi, pralaya by Brahman-Viṣṇu that reoccurs again and again.

4.11.THE PREDESTINATION OF I-JĪVA-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber opines that though the Eternal Thou created every I-Jīva in the nature of 'inborn Thou-relationship' and called them (I-Jīvas) into partners of I-Thou relationship with Him and with others (Thous), yet it is the I-Jīva (Thous) that determines its own destiny into heaven or hell by its own I-Thou or I-IT relationship. According to Madhvism, I-Jīvas (souls) predestined to heaven or hell because of their own nature (Svarūpa). It is not the Eternal Thou-Brahman-Viṣṇu who predestines the I-Jīvas to heaven or hell but the I-Jīvas themselves. This theory in

---

64. Tapasyānanda, Śrī Madhvācārya, His life, Religion and Philosophy, p.87.

Rarest Archiver

itself may not imply the idea of theological predestination.[65] In their freedom and will each I-Jīva in accordance to his own nature predestines itself into heaven or hell. Brahman-Viṣṇu never sends the I-Jīvas (souls) to heaven or hell but rather He gives prasāda (grace) to all I-Jīvas to realize their basic nature (savrūpa). Hence in Madhvism, it is not a predestination of Brahman-Viṣṇu, but self-destination of the I-Jīvas.

4.12.CONCLUSION:

As Religious leaders, realists, pluralists, theists, metaphysicians, Buber and Madhva were staunch believers in the reality of God (Eternal Thou-Viṣṇu), world (IT-Jagat), souls (I-Jīva) and Human Relationship (Respect); and in their systems we find adequate and clear affinity as regards the concepts of these are concerned. Both of them held that though God (the Eternal Thou-Brahman-Viṣṇu) is transcendent or Absolute Thou-Wholly Other, yet He is immanent in the spiritual and material beings (I-Jīva, nature) and in their interpersonal I-Thou relationship in the IT-Jagat (world). The Supreme Being (Eternal Thou-Brahman-Viṣṇu) is said to pervade the entire universe-material, spiritual (cētana and acētana) through His omnipresence and Thou relationship. The world of beings (animate and inanimate) have to depend on the Supreme Lord for their existence, sustenance, destruction and liberation-redemption (mukti). The goal or end of all I-Jīva (beings) is God and it is through His prasāda (grace and relationship) alone their liberation-redemption from this IT-Jagat (world) of pāpa (sin-I-IT relationship) and dukkha (suffering) is to be attained. In

---

65. Puthiadam, Viṣṇu the Ever Free, p.339.

Rarest Archiver

other words the I-Jīva has to attain his mukti-liberation-redemption-eschatology from the world of pāpa (sin) of his karmas (bad actions like dehumanization, depersonalization, degradation of man) through the unending bhakti (devotion) and in a healthy human interpersonal relationship of I-Thou to his Supreme Lord and other Thous (I-Jīvas).

According to Maurice Friedman, Martin Buber is more of an existential, social, religious and philosophical anthropologist[66], and the heart of his philosophy is 'Relationship' as the key concept. He uses the idea of relationship of I-Thou that has to happen in the sphere of the 'Between' (Interhuman) and of 'community'; and he portrays that the concepts of God, souls, and world have close knit relationship among them through the I-Thou relationship concept; and his philosophy starts with the philosophical anthropology and not with the metaphysics.[67]

Vyāsa-rāya, the most noted exponent of Madhva's doctrine, summarises the philosophy of Madhva in the following celebrated verse: "Śrīman Madhva-mate hariḥ paratarah satyam jagat tattvataḥ bhinna jīva-gaṇa harer anucara niccocca-bhāvam gataḥ/ miktir naija-sukh'anubhutir amala bhaktiḥ ca tat-sādhanam hy akṣadi-triyayam pramāṇam akhila-mnay'akika-vedyo Hari"//- In the religion of Śrī Madhva, Hari is the Supreme Being. The world of multiplicity is an ultimate reality. The Jīvas are different from these and among themselves. They are the servants of Hari, and there are distinctions of high and low among them. Liberation consists in the enjoyment of the bliss that is

---

66. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,pref.vii.
67. Martin Buber, KM, p. 60.

Rarest Archiver

inherent in oneself and the pure devotion (bhakti) is the means to attain it. There are three Pramāṇas (criteria for determining what is true) namely perception, inference and revealed scriptures. The sole purport of the entire Vēdic revelation is Hari.[68]

To say further the philosophy of Madhva is Sat-siddhānta, which means that the Supreme Lord Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu) is the eightfold dispenser of the universe. He is the abode of infinite auspicious a quality untouched by blemishes is Sarvōttama. Mukhyaprāṇa, his replica, the greatest among the sentient souls is Jīvōttama, dependent on the Supreme Lord. This real world provides the graded Jīvas deserved facilities to reach their proper destinations.[69] Thus, though Buber and Madhva belonged to two different religious, Theological and philosophical backgrounds, yet we see that the reality of God (Eternal Thou-Brahman-Viṣṇu), world (IT-Jagat), Man (I-Jīva) are interrelated concepts in their systems and teachings. Buber followed the Jewish traditions and held that the Bible (scriptures-revelation) is the old record of inter-human-Divine relationship of I-Thou experience of Israel with their God Yahweh.[70] Madhva's approach to the above concepts is also scriptures or Śruti (Vēdas) oriented; and he maintains that the Śruti is non-personal or authorless (apauruṣēya), self-valid and eternal (nitya) which portrays close relationship between Brahman-Viṣṇu, Jīva and world.

---

68. Tapasyānanda, Śrī Madhvācārya, His Life, Religion & Philosophy, p.94.
69. G.V.Nadguda, Op.Cit.,PP.iii-vii.
70. Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith, p.54.

Rarest Archiver

Further Buber in his philosophy of the I-Thou relationship has called God as the Absolute Thou who can be met and addressed as a 'PERSON', who creates, reveals, and redeems each Thou (I-Jīva). The real nature of God is person and the Eternal Thou. In Madhva's theology, Brahman-Viṣṇu is the Absolute Person, immutable (unchangeable, inalterable) Reality. He is independent. Though Jīvas (souls) and matter (Jada) are dependent on Him, yet they do not form His body. The body of Brahman-Viṣṇu is His transcendent perfection.

Buber holds that the Israelites as a chosen race (representing the whole humanity) were called upon to meet Yahweh their God though the -Thou relationship.[71] Further Buber says that the Eternal Thou (Yahweh) speaks with Moses the representative of the chosen race Israel on mount Horeb as: "I am who I am"[72]; and the term 'Eternal Thou' is not a substitutive word for the word 'God' that cannot be replaced by any.[73] Madhva too held that God (Brahman) is the Supreme Viṣṇu and the name of Viṣṇu cannot be replaced by any other name; and the Śruti texts (Scriptures) mention and speak only about Viṣṇu. So he says in his VTV, "I offer adoration always to Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu), who is cognizable in all his uniqueness only through the right scriptures, who wholly transcends the kṣāra (individual selves) and who is flawless and abounds in all excellent attributes.[74] Buber's Eternal Thou and Madhva's

---

71. Martin Buber, 'On the Bible', p.118.
72. RSV, BIBLE, Exodus, 3:14, p.50.
73. Martin Buber, IT, p.100.
74. S.S.Rāghavacār, VTV.No.1.p.1.

Rarest Archiver

Supreme Viṣṇu seem to complement and supplement each other in many points.

The relational experience of Israel is said to be the witness of a thousand year old I-Thou relation 'between the I of the speaking God and the Thou of the hearing Israel[75]. He accepted the Mosaic tradition (revelation) and of the Decalogue that mention of the nature and existence the Eternal Thou. Buber believes in the Bible, wherein God the Eternal Thou addresses individual and the community; and the people as a whole are called upon to sanctify in the community of persons.[76] Buber's inquiry into the knowledge and existence of God -Eternal Thou is 'Existence- relationship and Bible' oriented and man can reach the knowledge of the existence of Him in and through the address of I-Thou relational encounter. In each relationship the 'inborn Thou' is realized and it attains its perfection only in the direct relationship to the Eternal Thou. In each 'Thou' there is the presence of God (Divine -Eternal Thou) and in every being (Thou-other) there is the Divine spark; to each 'Thou' the highest (Eternal Thou) is opened. In the I-Thou relationship alone we infer and reach the existence of God. Yahweh is the Eternal I- the human 'Thou' who manifests Himself in his address to man and demands a loving return response from him.

In the understanding of Buber it is clear that God is not just an object of knowledge in the Bible but the only I-Thou relational partner in encounter in human history. Hence according to him the basic teaching of the Hebrew Bible is, "our life of I-Thou relationship between the above and below, between

---

75. Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith, p.54.
76. Maurice Friedmann, Op.Cit., pref.vii.

Rarest Archiver

heaven and earth".[77] The character of the Ten Commandments of the Bible is God-man I-Thou relationship and they are spoken by an I (The Eternal Thou) to a Thou. Every one of the commandments begin with an I and are addressed to a personal Thou.[78]; and heart of the Decalogue (Decalogue: The Ten Commandments, given to Moses by God at Mount Sinai (Exodus.20) inscribed on two tablets of stone[79] is the I-Thou relationship of Eternal Thou with humanity. Jesus Christ too in the New Testament of the Bible accepted the above concept as the basis of his teaching. He promised to carry them to completion as, "Not one dot, not one little stroke, shall disappear from the Law until its purpose is achieved".[80] We look behind the particular Thou the glimpse of God (the Eternal Thou) who is ever present and through everything that becomes present to us, we look toward the train of the Eternal Thou and in every true meeting, the Eternal Thou is included. It is only in our existence as persons, in our encounter with the finite Thous, we meet the Eternal Thou and we do not know anything of Him outside of this I-Thou encounter.[81] God is the Absolute Person and He is the one who becomes as person in order to know and be known, to love and be loved by all human beings. Through direct relationship of concrete and communion alone the Eternal Thou can be encountered and known. Buber's God is the God of the divine-human I-Thou encounter and He exists only in I-Thou relationship. God is conceived in reference to His creation or with His concrete

---

77. Martin Buber, 'On Judaism', PP.214-215.
78. Martin Buber, on the Bible, p.118.
79. RSV. Bible. Deuteronomy, 4:13
80. RSV. Bible, Mathew, 5:18.
81. Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.355.

Rarest Archiver

relationship with all His creatures in the universe. God takes initiative in inviting men to enter into personal relationship with Him and in the act of inviting men into encounter He Himself is known as a person and the person par excellence. He cannot be sought because He has no place. To know God as person is the religious and relational language and He should only be encountered in the I-Thou relationship. Therefore Buber writes, "Whoever goes forth to his Thou with his whole being, and carries to it all the being of the world, finds Him whom one cannot seek.[82] The theology of God (the Eternal Thou) and the systematic inquiry in to the deepest roots of the Eternal Thou according to Buber is mainly based on the principle of I-Thou relationship.

Madhva was more of a Śruti- Scripture-centered thinker and he bridges the realities of the infinite Brahman-Viṣṇu by the knowledge of the Vēdas (Śruti-Vēdas). In his BSBh, Madhva says, "Viṣṇu can only be known through the sacred texts".[83] Thus in his N.S, Jayatīrtha mentions, because the Vēdas tell us that God exists, the existence of Him is not a pure hypothesis and He really exists as a reality.[84] Also Brahman-Viṣṇu cannot be fully seen or described or reasoned out or known.[85] The Śruti (revelation) can establish Viṣṇu's real nature and attributes. Once we know Viṣṇu through the scriptures (Śruti) then we can also know Him through other means of knowledge like Pratyakṣa

---

82. Martin Buber, IT, p.1-4.
83. Puthiadam, God, p.21; B.S.Bh.I.i.3.
84. Nyāya-Sudha-Text quoted by Mle. Siauve.La Doctrine de Madhva.p.79; Puthiadam, 'God'.p.25.
85. BSBS.I.i.5; Puthiadam, 'God', p.22.

Rarest Archiver

(perception) and inference (anumāna) by rationalizing the deeper meaning of the Śrutis. It is through the genuine and correct interpretation of the Scriptures Madhva proved the Supremacy of Viṣṇu.[86] The terminology of 'Viṣṇu' as person was not a new invention of Madhva because he inherited it from the Vaiṣṇavism; and he had believed in Viṣṇu (God) before he came to philosophize on the doctrine of the existence of God.

86. Glasenapp,Viṣṇu Faith,PP.22-23; M.Padmanābhacārya, The Life and Teachings of Śrī Madhvācārya, PP.42-46.

Rarest Archiver

CHAPTER.5

THE CRITICAL ESTIMATION

5.1. INTRODUCTION:

So far, after having dealt at greater length with the philosophies of Buber and Madhva, now we are in a position to critically estimate and evaluate their systems and their contributions to the philosophy of I-Thou relationship. Our main concern under this section is to critically estimate and evaluate some of the most important philosophical doctrines of Buber and Madhva that are related to our fundamental part of the Research Work. Almost all the writings of Buber portray the variations of the same theme of I-Thou relationship; and Madhva too as a personalist, realist and pluralist thinker seems to maintain in his system of I-Thou relationship that can exist between God (Brahman-Visnu), Jīvas (Souls) and Jagat (World-nature); and in this regard we hold that Madhva is much related to the existential and anthropological philosophy of Martin Buber. One cannot turn the thought of Buber as a prose, for, his style is lyrical and his approach is mystical and intuitive; and if we express his poetical phrases and expressions in the formal statements, then they would lose their profound meaning and charm. Madhva too was a prolific writer in Sanskrit where he commanded prose and verse with equal ease. His prose is terse and telling. He errs on the side of brevity of expression and

Rarest Archiver

scrupulously avoids the ornate style; and his verses have solemnity, dignity and deep spiritual eloquence.[1]

5.2.THE 'RELATIONSHIP' AND THE 'EPISTEMOLOGY'-BUBER AND MADHVA:

Buber strongly maintained that by meeting and accepting one's Thou, I become 'I'; and in and through the acceptance of the finite Thou I meet the Eternal Thou (God) which also involves one's whole being. Thus, Buber established anthropological, existential, experiential and empirical foundations for man to be essentially a being in relationship of I-Thou. He calls the interhuman field between persons as 'relationship'. Through the discovery of the sphere of the 'Between' as the real ontological ground of man's existence and the locus of interhuman relation, Buber gave a significant reorientation to the understanding of man's existence in relationship. According to Frankenstein, the 'Between' of Buber seems to be no man's land. But in Buber's opinion, the 'Between' is a real realm of the spirit where the encounter between the I and the Thou takes place; and as reality the 'between' is always present at every authentic meeting between two people (Thous). Though Buber does not give any specific guarantee criteria to distinguish the relationship of human being with nature -tree, stone, cat etc, yet in his opinion We can relate to all these with the I-Thou relationship. According to Brunner the 'word (speech) unlocks person to person', and this concept seems to corroborate the doctrine of speech of Buber as address and response.[3] According to Buber, we see in human existence, the

---

1. B.N.K.Sharma, Teachings p.15.
3. Brunner, The Divine-Human Encounter, p.67.

Rarest Archiver

chance for meeting between two existing beings.[4] It is my 'relationship' that I owe to my partner (other) and not my existence, and the other becomes my Thou only in the relationship. He says, my I is not identical with his Thou or his Thou with my I. Further he clarifies and answers to Levinas' objection as, "To the person of the other I owe the fact that I have this Thou; but my I" (the I of the I-THOU relationship), I owe to saying Thou, not to the person to whom I say Thou".[5] Here it seems to be what Buber means when he says, "as I become I, I say Thou"[6], he maintains that the self becomes an I in saying Thou to the other.

As against Berkovits' objection, Buber clarifies and holds that no I-THOU relationship precedes the awareness of man's I; and the end of all I-THOU relationship is the self-consciousness of man. Buber writes: "The I emerges as a single element out of the primal experiences, out of the vital primal words I- affecting -Thou and Thou-affecting-I, only after they have been split asunder.[8]

Buber is accused of *subjectivism* by some of the philosophers, and this accusation may seem to be an unwarranted one, because his philosophy has strong ontological basis. Buber does not all together reject all scientific knowledge and objective reality that forms the IT world. He says that 'man lives in two worlds, the I-THOU and I-IT world, and if he tries to make his home in one alone, he cannot be a whole man. Thus it is clear that Buber does not condemn the I-IT world and its

---

4. Martin Buber, KM, p. 96.
5. Martin Buber, "Replies to my Critics", Schilpp, PMB, p. 697.
6. Martin Buber, IT, pp. 24-25.
8. Ibid.,pp. 36-37.

Rarest Archiver

relation. According to him, the world of IT is, both necessary and good. "But he who lives with IT alone is not a man".[9] Buber has given an illuminative and worthy treatment to the diverse interhuman situations such as education, marriage, ethics psychotherapy, social philosophy, and theology. The I-Thou philosophy of Buber provides also a basis for an ethical, social philosophy and religion, which are superior to both the individualistic and the collectivistic view of human being. On the common origin and connection of the terms like 'Address and Response', Buber developed well, the concept of relational (I-Thou) responsibility. Thus Buber seems to demand a responsible response to every address of Thou.[10] John Macmurray also speaks in this line of Buber as, the impulse to do this is nothing, but the impulse to be ourselves as fully and completely as possible with others, and the whole significance of human life lies here.[11] Harvey Cox accuses Buber of his rigid duality of the I-THOU and I-IT relations and gives a third intermediary category called 'human' and through which the urban man engages in relationship with his fellowmen without being intimate but being 'human'. Cox believes that the man in the city cannot have deep personal relationship with every one he meets there.[12] But however Buber totally rejects a third intermediary 'human' category of Cox. Now Buber would hold that the I-THOU relationship is established when we respond to the other with our whole being and the I-IT relation is established when we

---

9. Ibid.,p, 52.
10. Ibid., pp. 57-59.
11. Macmurray, Reason and Emotion, PP.101-102.
12. Harvey Cox, Secular City. Secularization and Urbanization in Theological Perspective, PP.48-50 (New York: Macmillan, 1966).

Rarest Archiver

respond only partially with the other. Buber is harsh and totally against persons being treated as things in interpersonal relationships. Buber writes: "I do not experience the man to whom I say *Thou*. But I take my stand in relationship to him, in the sanctity of the primary word".[13] One of the most important contributions of Buber is his rediscovery of the meaning and dignity of the person through relational 'mutuality' and 'personal, the theme that runs through all the writings of Buber. It is only in communion with our fellowmen or in personal life, we can be wholly ourselves; and he has emphasized the basic fact that man becomes a person only in communion with his Thou (of the other). This concept of Buber seems to be in line with other modern philosophers like Ebner, Jaspers, Guardini, and Steinbuechel etc. The fundamental truth that lies in the heart of Buber's philosophy is that 'no man is an island, or there cannot be such a thing as isolated individual.' In this era of depersonalization, Buber proclaims that man can achieve authentic human existence only by turning with his whole being to his fellowman in the attitude of I-THOU relationship alone. Going one step further from Kierkegaard, Buber interprets the concept of the person more concretely. The category of the 'Single One' is a lonely man detached from the world and stands alone before God in Kierkegaard's understanding. But Buber transformed this concept of the 'Single One' altogether and gave a new and broader interpreted meaning to it. According to his understanding, the relationship to fellowmen is a constitutive element of the Single One and this fellowman is a responsible living person who stands in his existential relationship with

---

[13]. Martin Buber, IT, p.22.

Rarest Archiver

God and his fellow human beings. The true concept of the 'Single One' signifies both the being for oneself and being for others. We are confronted with a linguistic paradox, which seems difficult and unclear, i.e., how should we speak to the Thou at all, without somehow coming under the sway of this paradox (I-IT). Thus in a fundamental sense, a person cannot be expressed, but can only be addressed and therefore Buber realizing this difficulty said, "BUT THIS is the exalted melancholy of our fate (existence), that every Thou in our world must become an It".[15] The 'Community' is another aspect essentially connected with the concept of the person in the Buberian system. He affirms that dynamically and relationally persons and community are interrelated. Heidegger admits that relationship is founded on participation and in taking part with the beings of the others; and in order to relate and commune with others, we should be there in the world together (community). Communing is called 'intersubjectivity' according to Gabriel Marcel.[16] To be 'with' others means to stand with and withstand with others. In standing and withstanding one another, I bring the authentic (Thou) that is within me and within the other. In real sense of the term, to be for the other we must stand over against the other.[17]

The concept of Buber's community could be taken as an original ideal of humanity, or a transcendental norm of concept, but it cannot be taken as an achievement within the history of

---

15. Ibid.,p. 31.
16. Gabriel Marcel, "I and Thou", in Schilpp, PMB, p.42.
17. F.J.Smith, "Phenomenology of Encounter", in Philosophy Today, 7 (1963), PP.198-200; Cf. also, Martin Buber, Autobiographical Fragments, in Schilpp, PMB, p.36.

Rarest Archiver

humanity. When the efforts are made to institutionalize the interhuman meeting or relationship between the persons of the community, then the depersonalizing the interpersonal relationships takes place. And thus in the understanding of Buber himself such depersonalization becomes replaced by 'social' relations that belong to the IT world. So the genuine community seems to be not possible historically. But we can say that such community has to be the goal of every human being to strive for.

His contribution to Theology is most significant wherein he extends the I-THOU relationship to God-Man relationship. His God is the Eternal Thou and a person. The Eternal Thou (God) can be addressed and He is the ground of all I-THOU relationships. God meets man as a person. He takes on Himself the personality in order to relate with us human beings. God is the Absolute person and He is the active existential ground of all human persons in the world. In another place Buber says that God is not only a person. Perhaps through this expression Buber means to say that God is beyond all human limitations. For God's being, the relationship is the essential characteristic.

Buber's understanding of God is balanced and for him, the world is the speech of God and Theophany. Buber understands God as the 'Wholly Other' the 'Wholly same', the 'wholly present' and He can be experienced in a mutual relationship that is ordained from the beginning. God is of course the "Mysterium Tremendum" who appears and overwhelms, but He is also the self-evident mystery that is closer to me than my own I".[19] Though God exists in his absolute unbridgeable distance; yet like a

---

[19]. Martin Buber, IT, p.104; Maurice Friedman,Op.Cit., p.355.

Rarest Archiver

partner not like a spectator He is constantly present in this world. We turn to God completely when we speak to Him.[20] We address God because He has already addressed us first. Our address to Him becomes our response to Him. Buber's main concern is man's relationship with God alone and purely intellectual knowledge of God does not interest him at all.[22] Whatever knowledge we may acquire about the absolute God, His mysteriousness cannot be diminished or lessened. We (may) come near to God but we are not nearer to unveiling the being of God and solving its riddle.[23]

Buber understands that it is because of His will (as in Madhva system that Viṣṇu out of his iccha creates the world) that God establishes His relationship with human beings and in return the human beings have the capacity to enter into His absolute relationship. For Buber, the world is in the Absolute God who is related to all things in the world. So these types of thoughts . . . are the outlines of pantheism and Buber seems to support such.

Buber's writings have elements of Mysticism too. In the early period of his thought though Buber was much influenced by the mystical thought of Hassidism, Jacob Boehme, Meister Eckhart etc, he rejects or repudiates any glimpses of such mysticism in his philosophical thought patterns. According to him, this type of mystical unity cannot be the end of human life because it destroys the very fundamental and lasting (abiding) duality of

---

20. Martin Buber, "Replies to my Critics", Schilpp, PMB, p.713; Cf. also, Buber, Philosophical Interrogations, p.88.

22. Martin Buber, EG, pp. 32-33.

23. Martin Buber, IT, p.142.

Rarest Archiver

encounter of man with God. Therefore, Buber praises the Gospel of John in the Bible as essentially the Gospel of pure relationship. He says, "It is really the Gospel of pure relationship. Here is a truer verse than the familiar mystical verse: 'I am Thou and Thou art I.' The Father and the Son, like in being—we may even say God and Man, like in being—are the indissolubly real pair, the two bearers of the primal relation, which from God to man looking and hearing, and between both is termed knowledge and love".[24] He writes, "Through everything that becomes present to us, we gaze toward the train of the Eternal Thou; in each we perceive a breath of it; in each Thou we address the eternal Thou".[25] We should not renounce the world but establish it upon its proper ground (God). Whoever sees the world in the eternal Thou, stands in His presence.[26] "He who goes out with his whole being to meet his *Thou* and carries to it all the being that is in the world, finds Him who cannot be sought. He (God) is the mystery of the self-evident, nearer to me than my own I.[27] According to Buber any attempt to systematize philosophy will destroy the relational character of his spontaneous philosophical thought. Buber says that his main work is to open the window and point to something in reality that had not or had too insignificant a reality.[28] And again Buber does not demand a supreme degree of the I-THOU relationship in all the spheres of life in this world.[29]

---

24. Ibid.,p.111.
25. Ibid.,pp.19, 99, 100, 130.
26. Ibid.,IT, pp.120-122.
27. Ibid.,p.104; Maurice Friedman, Op.Cit.,p.355.
28. Martin Buber, "Replies to my Critics", Schilpp, PMB, p. 693.
29. Martin Buber, BMM, pp. 56-57.

Rarest Archiver

As regards the epistemology of Madhva is concerned, the theory of perception and knowledge is the philosophical foundation of Dvaita system. Madhva maintained that by perceiving, we become aware of something that is unique and different (bhinna) from the rest of other things and the perceiving self or being. Hence we can say that for the genuine knowledge there is the differences between the things and things and between perceiving self and things. And because of this and the limit of senses there is the limits of knowledge as well; and when we deny the perception, it is to deny the possibility of knowledge. All those who affirm the identity and deny the truth of differences seem to be in the position of absurdity by claiming the knowledge while rejecting the perception that is the very foundation of knowledge. By necessity the perception (pratyaksa) implies that there is a perceiver and the perceived (thing, being) that is also distinct existent from the perceiver. Knowledge is also relative, in the sense that it is relative to some knower and to some known things as well. Hence Madhva is an epistemological and ontological realist. In reality we experience and perceive this world (Jagat) as constituted of different selves as well as material objects (things). This empirical Jagat (world) is real as well as pluralistic.[30]

In the field of epistemology Madhva's contributions have been outstanding and in some respects far ahead of his time. His comprehensive definition of 'Pramāṇa' and its clear distinction into 'Kēvala' and 'Aṇu' and, above all, his conception of Sākṣi as the ultimate criterion of all knowledge and validity are front-rank contributions to epistemology. Its repercussions on

---

Puligandla, Foundations of Indian Philosophy, PP.237-238).

Rarest Archiver

realism in modern thought are sure to be fruitful, if properly exploited. His own realism is thereby established on the firm philosophical foundation of intuitionism instead of empiricism pure and simple.

Madhva has gone far ahead of his contemporaries and compeers in having postulated a new principle of truth-determination in epistemology in the form of Sākṣi, as the ultimate criterion of truth, which is infallible and intrinsically valid. Its raison d'etre are (1) that it alone can be the ultimate guarantor of the validity of all other pramāṇas, (2) that it is the logical fulfillment and culmination of any really self-complete theory of knowledge, and (3) that it is the only means of intuitive perception of certain supersensuous categories like Time, Space, the nature of the self and its attributes, the mind and its modes, all knowledge of pleasure and pain etc. The keynote of Madhva's philosophy has always been the acceptance of the ONE INDEPENDENT REAL as "Parasiddhanta" and all the rest as of secondary importance (Cf. MGB.ii.24). Madhva is original in his ontological theory of Svatantra (Independence) and Paratantra (dependent) that is the keynote of his philosophy.

Madhva, by applying the doctrine of Saviśeṣabhēda to Brahman preserved its complete homogeneity, without sacrificing infinite richness of its qualitative content thereby introducing a more dynamic- colourful conception of Brahman through the doctrine of identity-in-difference for the first time in Indian thought. Madhva has given an entirely new orientation to the concept of "Difference" by the acceptance of "Viśēṣas". His theory of "Viśēṣas" is the life breath of the doctrine of identity-in-difference, in any school of thought ancient or

Rarest Archiver

modern. Since no other school has accepted 'Viśēṣas", the credit for the philosophical conception of "identity-in-difference" should also go to Madhva. This theory of Viśēṣas is his most outstanding contribution to the stock of philosophical ideas in Indian thought. Its elasticity and resilience to admit of internal distinction of reference, without the disadvantage of "difference", "difference-cum- identity", "Samavaya (harmony)" or "fictitious difference" (kālpanikabhēda), through the inner resources of the substance itself, replaces many worn-out and outmoded conceptions of time, space, causation and creation by more satisfactory ones. This is no small contribution to thought.[31]

Humanity desires to know truths about God (Brahman-Viṣṇu) and some of these truths can be known through reasoning, through philosophical analysis etc. Further, many of the truths about God can be known through divine revelation and scriptures (āgama-Vēdas, śrutis). These scriptures, revelations can give quickly and accurately the truths concerning God; and God is said to be beyond sense experience.

Madhva maintains that talk about God (Viṣṇu) or about God in Himself is possible. The nature of God can be not only known negatively (through the way of negation) but also known positively or affirmatively (through the way of affirmation). We as human beings attribute many attributes or perfections to God.

THE independence of Brahman (Viṣṇu) is the most vital point in Madhva's conception of God. The twin principles of "Svātantra" and "Paratantra" constitute the pith of his

---

31. B.N.K. Sharma, Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya, PP.41-42, 44-45.169.

Rarest Archiver

philosophy. It is to this central ontological concept of his philosophy that the traditional name "Dvaita" given

has reference. It has been shown that Madhva has gone beyond all other Indian thinkers in emphasizing the absolute independence and unutterable majesty of Brahman. His conception of Svātantra rises above the Dualism of Prakṛti and Puruṣas by denying them any kind of independent existence (consciousness) or activity. We have seen how even the eternal entities have been brought out by Madhva under the sway of Brahman by means of the doctrine of creation through "Parādhīnaviśeṣāpti."

Hence we see that Madhva solved the problem of one and many through bringing the metaphysical dependence of many (realities) on one supreme Being. Therefore the realization and knowledge of the one Brahman (Viṣṇu) leads us to the knowledge of man -cētana and acētana[32].

5.3. BUBER'S CONTRIBUTION:

Martin Buber's unique contribution to the present century has been his unrelented emphasis on the dignity of the human being. By steeping himself in the rich fund of Hasidic literature, Buber was able to appropriate the most salient Hasidic ideals of spiritual fervor, loving kindness, holiness and joy in the service of God and fellow men and make of them the very foundation of his own philosophical personalist position. Buber's theistic posture is an invaluable antidote to the dark and despairing atheistic existentialism of Jean Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir (Perhaps even Martin Heidegger and the earlier Albert Camus might be included here). Where Sartre proclaims the death of God as a "valid statement of fact", Buber

---

[32]. Dominic, God, World, Soul,p.178.

Rarest Archiver

proclaims an Eternal Thou, ever present in every genuine human interpersonal relationship. This Eternal Thou is the Center, the bond, the foundation for the between, so absolutely indispensable for every true community, every valid "I-THOU" relationship. While Sartre holds that mankind "must take courage, it must give up once and for all the search for God, it must forget God," Buber counters it by asserting that the only way in which man can find a meaningful and authentic existence is against the background of the Eternal Thou (God), who alone gives purpose and rationality to life.

We may aptly close our remarks with the following two tributes penned by Buber's scholars. Eugen Biser wrote the first, two years before Buber's death in this way, "Martin Buber stands out as one of the few great minds among us, unbroken by the distress of his people or the burden of a long life, standing upright under the light of true wisdom as one who wants light ever while he speaks of darkness, a man who has increased knowledge and therefore suffering too. He awakens confidence in victory, and he reaches out a brother's hand to everyone who is willing."

Will Herberg evaluates Buber's contribution to twentieth century thought in the following words: "There can be no doubt as to the greatness and originality of Buber's thought. Not since Maimonides in the Middle Ages has there been a Jewish philosopher who has had such a profound impact upon the religious and humanistic thinking of his time as Martin Buber has had upon the thinking of our generation... What is the secret of this man? In what does that unique power and relevance of his thought consist? I should say that the significance of his

Rarest Archiver

thinking consists primarily in this-that he, more than any man of his time, has succeeded in developing a philosophy that does full justice to the unique reality and value of the individual human being over against the mass man. Martin Buber has shown us what it really means to be a human being in the inwardness of the self, in community with others, in fellowship with God. Herein lies his message for our time and for all time".[33]

5.4.THE CRITICAL EVALUATIONS ON MADHVA SYSTEM:

As regards the Dvaita theories of Svarūpabhēda, Tāratamya and the concept of Traividhya, is concerned, many philosophers and thinkers vehemently criticized the same. According to the doctrine of Traividhya there is no Sarvamukti or universal salvation, because it predestines the Jīvas or souls to 'mokṣa' or 'damnation' into eternal hell. So the soul's destiny through its own nature (svarūpa) is already fixed beforehand. Now how can this type of soul attain mukti through any means or sādhana? Thus all the sādhanas or means or efforts of the Jīvas such as Nitya-Saṁsārins and Tamoyōgyas go in vain. This is fatalism for the Nitya- saṁsārins and Tamoyōgyas and only mukti-yōgya souls are saved. So, there is no hope of salvation (mukti) for such a type of Nitya-Samsārins and Tamoyōgya souls.

Madhva maintained that the basic nature or svarūpa of such souls cannot be changed by any amount of spiritual exercises or discourses, of yōgas or means (sādhanas) because they are Tāmasa or rajas in their nature. Who is the cause of this svarūpa and their damnation? Neither God nor the souls are the cause according to Madhva's understanding. Can the karma of the soul be responsible for the nature of Soul? Elsewhere Madhva

---

[33]. Francis J. Lescoe, Existentialism, PP.168-170.

Rarest Archiver

maintained that the cause exists in the intrinsic diversity of souls nature or human nature that is called the 'adṛstaniyama' or "anādi-svarūpayōgyata" of the individual.[34]

Thus ultimately the nature of souls is the cause of everything for the souls. But what about the free will and the freedom of souls? Though, the karma may imply freedom and freedom - choice, and the choice has to be made in accordance to the inner svarūpa (innate nature) of each Jīva, so freedom itself is said to be the expression of the innate nature (svarūpa) of each soul. Whatever it is, in the Madhva system, it is the Svarūpa of Jīva that decides the destiny to Jīva.

Further Madhva emphatically holds that a soul can only be saved (attain mukti) through the prasāda (grace) of Viṣṇu. But the grace of God is effective and becomes useful only to the mukti-yōgyas and to the nityasaṁsārins, but the tamoyōgyas cannot be saved any time in any way. Now at this juncture a question is raised about the utility and the efficacy of God's grace as far as the Nitya samsārins and Tamoyōgyas souls are concerned, because it is they who really require God's grace for their mukti (salvation). Is God partial to these souls and impartial to others? Madhva maintains that though God may be able to change the nature of souls, yet He does not do that, for, to change the nature of souls is to annihilate the souls; because the very nature is the essence of the soulhood (Jīvahood) of soul and any change of nature may destroy the individuality of it. God cannot change the nature of beings at all. Almost all the world religions propagate that God is kind and merciful to the sinners who need the mercy and grace of God.

---

[34]. BSBh.ii, 3.51.

Rarest Archiver

So how does the Dvaita system of Madhva maintain the ethical life and the moral life? Here it seems to be that one can enter into apathy or indifferentism. According to the understanding of Radhakrishnan, one cannot have an useful ethics unless he is in a position to believe in the spiritual possibilities of every person who has the divine form in him.[35]

According to Madhva every soul (Jīva) is the reflection (pratibimba) of God, for, it possesses the attributes of divine such as, existence, consciousness and bliss(sat,cit, ānanda) but in a limited way. But the question posed here is that how can the nitya-samsārins and tamoyōgyas considered to be the reflection (pratibimba) of God as they are in possession of rajasa and tāmasa qualities (guṇas), and yet they cannot attain mukti (liberation). If all the souls have the attributes of God, they should all attain liberation in God. To all these objections, Madhva might answer by holding that these type of Jīvas (souls) because of their rajasa and tāmasa natures cannot possess the attributes of God, as in the example of a dirty mirror that cannot reflect the light of the sun. At this juncture how can we hold that these Jīvas are also reflection or are similar to God? Though many pandits of Madhva system have answered satisfactorily to the critical minds of humanity, yet the above questions do require a deeper learning into the Madhva system.

5.5.CONCLUSIONS:

In the course of this comparative Research Work we have brought in and pointed out many similarities and few

---

35. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, Vol.II, (New Delhi: Blackie & Son), p.751.

Rarest Archiver

dissimilarities in the thoughts of Martin Buber and Madhvācārya as regards the theme of I-Thou relationship is concerned. Both of them in the truer sense admit that there is a very close-knit interrelationship between God (Eternal Thou-Brahman-Viṣṇu), Man (I-Jīva) and World (IT-Jagat). Particularly Buber's is a human existence-oriented philosophy and Madhva's is a Śruti-oriented (religio-philosophical) system. While we compare two systems or thought forms, one should not necessarily pass value judgment to both systems maintaining that one system is superior or inferior to the other. It is because as a matter of fact, each and every philosophical thought develops according to its own background, tradition, and context that may be true or relevant in its own particular traditional or contextual situation. Hence at times I have only stated the different thought-forms in Buber and Madhva and I have not made a value judgment as regards their philosophies are concerned. It is a fact that deep down, the thought-forms of I-Thou relationship are complementary in Buber and Madhva because both of them are realists, pluralists, theists, existentialists and anthropologists. This should be also borne in mind that all through this research work the existential-anthropocentric theories of Buber and essence-centered teachings of Madhva stand out distinctively and vividly.

Buber and Madhva very strongly held the theocentric approaches as regards God is concerned; and they maintained that God (Eternal Thou- Viṣṇu) is the center of all, greatest being, most perfect being and the only free being in the order of beings; and He is the first in the hierarchy of substantial realities.

Rarest Archiver

To all the theistic thinkers and religious men, especially to Buber and Madhva, God is a mystery, a pramāṇarahasya. He is apprehensible, but not comprehensible. He is inexpressible, impossible to conceptualize. He is the supreme subject and cannot be considered as an object. He is transcendent. Even through scriptures or struti, God cannot be fully comprehended by man. So the proofs for the existence of God are not mathematical demonstrations. All proofs, whether they be the metaphysical proofs, proofs drawn from the moral consciousness of man, or from mystical experiences, relational proofs, all these are subject to criticism and objections. When proofs are wrenched out of their experiential and religious matrix and made abstract, mathematical, and apodictic, then such proofs should create in all a feeling of uneasiness. But the spirit of the proofs, in the final analysis, is nothing but the search for God and the recognition of the Supreme Being who is the very basis of all experienced reality?[36]

Further, man cannot have a perfect concept of what God is, God's nature and His relationship to the world of beings. For, our knowledge is limited and our concepts are being drawn from the world of experience, are conditioned. Though the philosophies of Buber and Madhva throw considerable light on the subject, yet it should motivate us to do further in-depth reflection.

The modern trend of thought is humanistic and 'anthropocentric'. Man is the center or the focus of all the present day studies, inventions and research. Hence, any philosophy, to be relevant, is expected to answer the problems of

---

[36] . Puthiadam, God, PP.83-84.

Rarest Archiver

modern man such as oppressive structures, injustices, economic disparities and poverty, ecological imbalances, communalism and religious fundamentalism. In the name of God and religion human beings fight, kill each other and have been shedding blood since centuries. Today the need of the hour is not the knowledge of God or deity but man himself. Today we need to find the religion of humanity besides searching for the Supreme Being. Only the Human I-Thou religion and relationship can save the humanity from this chaos that man himself has created for himself. So God, conceived as transcendent, immutable, omnipotent, independent and so on may not interest the present day men and women much. We need to evolve a philosophy of God, of a God who is the absolute 'Thou'; of a God who is immanent, involved in human existence, its sufferings and pains; of a God who gives direction to the history of mankind; of a God who is the ultimate goal and destiny of man that by attaining whom we gain liberation (mukti) from this Dukkha-maya Saṁsāra (suffering world).

India is religious and culturally a pluralistic country. We have here a wealth of religious and philosophical traditions, and rich antiquity of history, customs, manners and beliefs. Yet the influx of modern ideas via mass media has created new problems. So the social, political and economic state of our country that is intimately related to and in some ways rooted in the religions and ethos of our people, should become the part of our philosophical reflection and questioning in collaboration with western thoughts and insights.

In their times Buber and Madhva, though remaining faithful to the valid insights of their particular religions, i.e.,

Rarest Archives

Jewish and Hinduism (Vaiṣṇavism) respectively, and past philosophies, had the courage to rethink the past conceptions of God and His relation with world and man, in the light of the problems besetting them and their societies. Today we are living in a critical and transitional period of history with its technological, scientific progress, nuclear and computer advancements, and the globalization of the struggles and tragedies of mankind. So we are called upon to critically examine the past, with its religio-philosophical trends, in the light of our present day problems and concerns. The many crucial facts facing us force us to reflect on the meaning of our lives and of our history. From out of our openness to the disclosure of God in nature and history, in meditation and mystical experiences, and through our reflection on these disclosures with the valid insights drawn from the philosophies of Buber and Madhva, there will certainly emerge new thought-forms and concepts of God, and His relationship with man and the world of beings.

Rarest Archives

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. WORKS OF MARTIN BUBER:

1. Buber, Martin, Between Man and Man. Trans. By Ronald G. Smith. London & Glasgow: Collins, The Fontana Library, 1969, (Cited in the footnotes as BMM)
2. Ibid., Daniel: Dialogues of Realization. Trans. by M. Friedman. New York: McGraw -Hill, 1965.
3. Ibid., Eclipse of God. Trans. by M.Friedman et al. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1957, (Cited in the footnotes as EG)
4. Ibid., For the Sake of Heaven. A Chronicle. Trans. by Ludwig Lewsohn. New York: A Temple Book, Athenaeum, 1969.
5. Ibid., Good and Evil. Trans. by R. G. Smith. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1953.
6. Ibid., Hasidism, New York: The Philosophical Library, 1948.
7. Ibid., I and Thou. With a Postscript by Author. Trans. by R.G. Smith. 2nd . ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark ,1994. (Cited in the footnotes as IT).
8. Ibid., Kingship of God. Trans.by R. Scheimann. New York: Harper&Bros., 1962.

Rarest Archiver

9. Ibid., The Knowledge of Man. Ed. And Trans. by M. Friedman, New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965. (Cited in the footnotes as KM).

10. Ibid., Moses, Essays on Religion. Trans. by G. Hort. Melbourne and London: Melbourne University Press& Oxford University Press, 1946.

11. Ibid., On the Bible. Eighteen Studies. Ed. By Nahum N.Glatzer. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.

12. Ibid., Pointing the Way. Ed. And Trans.by M.Friedman, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957.

13. Ibid., "Replies to My Critics." The Philosophy of Martin Buber. Ed.by.P.Schilpp and M. Friedman. The Library of Living Philosophers. La Salle, Ill.: Open Court, 1967.

14. Ibid., Two Types of Faith. Trans. by. N. Goldhawk. New York: Harper. 1967.

15. Ibid., The Writings of Martin Buber. Selected, Ed. And introduced by W. Herberg. Cleveland & New York: Meridian Books, 1970.

B. WORKS ON MARTIN BUBER:

Rarest Archiver

1.Bergman, Hugo, "Martin Buber and Mysticism". The Philosophy of Martin Buber. Ed. By Schilpp and Friedman,

2.Berkovit, Elizer, A Jewish Critique of the Philosophy of Martin Buber. Studies in Torah Judaism, No. 3. New York: Yeshiva University, 1962.

3.Brown, James. Kierkegaard, Heidegger, Buber and Barth. Subject and Object in Modern Theology. New York: Collier Books, 1962.

4.Cohen, Arthur. Martin Buber, London: Bowes &Bowes, 1957.

5.Friedman, Maurice, Martin Buber's Life and Work, Search Press, London,1982.

6. Ibid., Martin Buber's Life and Work, New York, 1981-1984.

7. Ibid., Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960

8. Ibid., Thinkers of the 20th Century, Himalayan Books, New Delhi, 1987.

8.Hodes, Aubrey, Martin Buber: An Intimate Portrait. New York: The Viking Press, 1971.

9.Kuhn, Helmut, Dialogue in Expectation. The Philosophy of Martin Buber. Ed.by Schilpp & Friedman,

10.Jacobs, J.Noah The Hebrew Humanism of Martin Buber, Detroit, 1973

11.Lescoe, Francis, J., Existentialism With or Without God, Alba House, New York, 1974

Rarest Archiver

12.Macquarrie, John, 20th Century Religious Thought, SCM Press Ltd., London, 1988.

13.Macquarrie, John, Existentialism, Penguin Books, London, 1086.

14.Martain, Jacques Existence and the Existent, Image Books, New York, 1957.

15.Oraison, Marc, Being Together, Image Books, New York, 1971.

16.Pfuetze, Paul,E, "Martin Buber and American Pragmatism". The Philosophy of Martin Buber. Ed.by Schilpp and Friedman.

17.Rome, Sydney & Rome, Beatrice, Philosophical Interrogations, New York, 1964.

18.Smith, R.G., Martin Buber. Makers of Contemporary Theology Series. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1967.

19.Smith, R.G., The Thought of Martin Buber. Burning Glass Paper, No. 18. Shorne, Kent: Ridgeway House, 1947.

20.Smith, R.G., "Translator's Introduction". Martin Buber: I and Thou. 2nd ed. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1958.

21.Srinivasan, G., Philosophical Perspectives: East and West, Associated Printers and Publishers, Mysore, 1988.

Rarest Archiver

22.Srinivasan, G., The Existentialist Concepts and the Hindu Philosophical Systems, Udayana Publications, Allahabad, 1967.

23.Srinivasan,G., Recent Trends in Western Philosophy, The Bangalore Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd., Bangalore,1981.

24.Taubes, Jacob. "Buber and Philosophy of History." The Philosophy of Martin Buber. Ed. by Schilpp and Friedman.

25.Vesey.G., Foulkes,P. Collins Dictionary of Philosophy, London & Glasgow, 1990.

26.Warnock, Mary, Existentialism, Oxford University Press, New York, 1985.

27.Wood,Robert E. Martin Buber's Ontology. An Analysis of I and Thou. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969.

A. WORKS OF ŚRĪ MADHVĀCĀRYA:

1.Madhvācārya, Sarva-Mūla-Granthāh, Collection of the Complete Works of Śrī Madhvācārya; ed. By Bannanje Govindācārya vols. 1-5, Bangalore, Akhila Bharata Madhva Maha Mandala, 1969-1974

2. Ibid., Śrīmad-Viṣṇu-Viniṛnaya, Trans. into English, by S.S. Raghavacar, Mangalore, Ramakrishna Ashram, 1959.

Rarest Archiver

3. Ibid., Viṣṇu-Tattva-Vinirṇaya, Trans. into English with Detailed Notes by K.T. Pandurangi, Bangalore, Dvaita Vedānta Studies and Research Foundation, 1991.

4. Ibid., Upaniṣadprasthāna: English Trans, and Notes of Śrī Madhvācārya's Commentaries on Upaniṣads by K.T. Pandurangi. Chirtanur, Śrīman Madhva Siddhāntonnahini Sabha,
-Bṛihadāṇyakakōpaniṣad, n.d.
-Īshvasya Talavakana Kathaka Upaniṣads, 1985. Chandogyōpaniṣad, 1987.
Aitareyōpaniṣad 1989.
Taittiryōpaniṣad,1990

5. Ibid., Upaniṣadprasthāna, Kannada Translation of Śrī Madhvācārya' Commentaries on Upaniṣads. Bangalore Akhila Bhārata Mādhva Mahā Maṇḍala and Anand Thīrtha Prastisthāna, 1988.

6. Ibid., Gītāprasthana, Kannada Translation of Śrī Madhvācārya's Gīta Bhaṣya and Gīta Tātparya, Bangalore Akhila Bhārata Mādhva Mahā Maṇḍala and Ananda Thīrtha Prastisthāna, 1988.

7. Ibid., Anubhāṣya, Trans., by S.S. Rāghavacār, Madras, Dharmaprakash Publications, 1973.

8. Ibid., The Bhagavadgīta Bhāṣya, rendered into English by B.N.K. Sharma, Bangalore, Anandatīrtha Pratisthāna, 1989.

Rarest Archiver

9. Ibid., Sarva-Darśan-Saṃgraha, Trans. by. E. B. Cowell and A.E. Gough. Varṇasi, Chowkamba Sanskrit Series office, 1978.

B. WORKS ON MADHVA AND DVAITA VEDANTA:

1. Archak, K.B., Śaṅkara and Madhva on the Īśvasya Upaniṣad, Dharwad, Author, 1981.

2.Dasgupt, S., A History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. IV, pp. 51-319, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1975.

3.Ghate, V.S., The Vedānta: A study of the Brahmasūtras with the Bhāṣyas of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Nimbāraka, Madhva and Vallbha. Pune Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1960.

4. Glasenapp, H.Von., Madhva's Philosophy of the Viṣnu Faith, Trans by Shridhar B. Shrothri and ed. by K.T. Pandurangi Bangalore, Dvaita Vedānta Studies and Research Foundation, 1992.

5.Govindācārya, B., Madhvācārya. Trans. by K. Krishnamurthy and U.P. Upadyaya. Uḍupi, Śrī Pejavar Mutt, 1984.

6.Jayatīrtha, Vādāvali, Trans. into English by Śrī Nāgarāja Rao. Madras, n.d.,

7.Krishna, S.R., Outline of the Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya, Tumkur, Author, 1951.

Rarest Archiver

8.Nārain, K., An Outline of Madhva Philosophy, New Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal Pub., 1986.

9.Padmanābhacār, C.M., Life and Teachings of Śrī Madhvācārya, Bombay, Pattabiraman and Vittal, 1983.

10.Pandurangi,K.T., Essentials Of Upaniṣads. According to Śrī Madhvācārya Bhāṣya, Bangalore, Poorna Prajña Vidyapīṭha, 1991.

11.Pandurangi, K.T., Essentials of Gītābhāṣya and Gītātatparya of Śrī Madhvācārya, Bangalore, Akhila Bhārata Mādhva Mahā Maṇḍala and Ānandathīrtha Pratisthāna, 1987.

12.Puthiadam, I, Viṣṇu the Ever Free: A study of the Madhva Concept of God, Madurai, Dialogue Series, 1985

13.Raghavendracār, H.N, Dvaita Philosophy and Its Place in the Vedānta, Mysore, Mysore University, 1941.

14.Rāghavacār, S.S., Dvaita Vedānta, Madras, Madras University,1977.

15.Rāmacandran, T.P., Dvaita Vedānta, New Delhi, Arnold Heinman, 1976.

16.Rao, Alur, Venkat, Handbook of Śrī Madhvācārya's Pūrna-Brahma Philosophy, Dharwad, Navajeenan Grantha Banday, 1954.

Rarest Archiver

17.Rao, Krishan, C.R., Śrī Madhva, His Life and Doctrine, Udupi, Śrī Madhva Muni Sevā Sangha, 1929.

18.Rao, Krishnaswamy, Outlines of the Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya, Tumkur, Author, 1951.

19.Rao,Nāgarāja,P., The Epistemology of Dvaita Vedānta, Madras, The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1976.

20.Shanbhag. D.N., Some Problems in Dvaita Philosophy, Dharwad, Śrī Rāma Prakāshana, 1982.

21.Shanbhag, D.N., Śrī Madhvācārya and His Cardinal Doctrines, Vol. 1., Dharwad, Bharath Book Depot and Prakashan, 1990.

22.Sharma, B.N.K., Madhva's Teaching in His own Word, Bombay, Bhāratiya Vidhyā Bhavan, 1979.

23. Ibid., Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya, Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, 1991.

24. Ibid., History of the Dvaita School of Vedānta and its Literature, Vols., I-II, New Delhi, Motilal Banarsidas, 1981.

25. Ibid., Svatantrādvaita or Madhva's Theistic Realism, Madra, G.S. Press, 1942.

26. Ibid., Lectures on Vedānta, Dharwad, Karnataka University,1979.

27. Ibid., The Bṛhadaraṇyaka Upaniṣad Expounded From Śrī Madhvācārya's Perspective. Bangalore,

Rarest Archiver

Dvaita Vedānta Study and Research Foundation, 1988.

28. Ibid., The Brhamasūtras and their Principal Commentaries, A Critical Expo., Vol. I-III, New Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal, Pub., 1986.

29. Ibid., Madhva's Aupaniṣadam Dharśanam, Bangalore, Dvaita Vedānta Studies and Research Foundation, n.d.

30. Ibid., Reign of Realism in Indian Philosophy, (Radical Realism and Pluralistic Theism) Dvaita Vedānta of Madhva, Madras, National Press, 1931.

31.Tapasyānanda., Bhakti Schools of Vedānta: Śrī Madhvācārya, pp. 107-200. Madras, Śrī Rāmakrishna Math, 1990.

32.Vādirāja, Vādirāja's Refutation of Śaṅkara's non-dualism: Clearing the Way for Theism, Trans., by Stafford Betty. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1978.

33. Vādirāja, Yukti Mllika, Trans. into Kannada, Bhima Rao. Davanagere, 1977.

C. GENERAL WORKS ON HINDU PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

1.Abhēdānanda, Swamy, Life Beyond Death—A Critical Study of Spiritualism, Calcutta, Ramakrishna Vedānta Math,1984.

Rarest Archiver

2.Banerjee, N., V., The Spirit of Indian Philosophy, New Delhi, Arnold-Heinmann, 1974.

3.Bhatt, Govardhan, P., The Basic Ways of Knowing, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1989.

4.Chatterjee, & Datta, Introduction to Indian Philosophy, Calcutta, University of Calcutta, 1968.

5.Herman, A., L., Problems of Evil and Indian Thought, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1976.

6.Hiriyanna, M., Popular Essays in Indian Philosophy, Mysore, Kavyalaya Pub., 1984.

7.Hiriyanna, M., Outlines of Indian Philosophy, Bombay, Blackie and Son Pub., 1983

8.Joshi,R.C., Rebirth-An Analysis of the Hindu Philosophy of Rebirth., New Delhi, Metropolitan Book Co., 1988.

9.Kumar, Pramod, Mokṣa-The Ultimate Goal of Indian Philosophy, Gaziabad, Indo-Vision.1984.

10.Lal, Chhanglal, Philosophy of Bhakti, New Delhi, D.K. Publishers, 1989.

11.Mahadeva, T.,M.,P., Outlines of Hinduism, Bombay, Chetana, 1984.

12.Mc.Mullen, Clarence,ed., The Problem of Death and Suffering in Indian Religions, Delhi, Lithouse, 1983.

Rarest Archiver

13.Nag, Anita, Six Systems of Vedānta Philosophy, Calcutta, Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1986.

14.O'Flaherty, W., D., ed., Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Traditions, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.

15.Parrinder, Geoffrey, Avtār and Incarnation—A Comparison of Indian and Christian Beliefs, New York, Oxford University Press, 1982.

16.Radhakrishnan, S., Indian Philosophy, Vol.II, Delhi, Blackie and Son Pub., 1985.

17. Radhakrishnan, S., Eastern Religions and Western Thought, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1988.

18.Ram, G. M., Bible of Hinduism, New Delhi, Allied Publishers, 1985.

19.Sinha, Jadunath, Outlines of Indian Philosophy, Calcutta, New Central Book Agency, 1985.

Rarest Archiver